

REALITIES OF BYZANTINE  
PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT:  
HELLAS AND PELOPONNESOS,  
1180–1205

JUDITH HERRIN

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the advice and assistance I have received in the course of this research from Professor H. Ahrweiler, Professor H. G. Beck, Dr. A. A. M. Bryer, the R. P. J. Darrouzès, Professor P. Lemerle, and Professor N. Svoronos; and the splendid generosity of Dumbarton Oaks which enabled me to complete the work for publication.

## INTRODUCTION

THE Byzantine Empire was governed through a complex administrative system, predominantly military in nature, within which civilian and ecclesiastical sectors played a significant role, though one definitely subordinated to the essential needs of the Empire's defense. Studies of the administrative structure rely heavily on lists of officials and their honorary titles, and on records of persons attending important functions at court, which reflect the significance attached to particular posts and the seniority of offices. Based on these lists, a whole hierarchy of ranks can usefully be drawn up, but little about the working of Byzantine administration can be reconstructed. Even when the existence of certain positions is confirmed by persons holding the appropriate title, there is often no evidence that the formal role assigned to them was being executed.

Because of the almost total lack of sources and documentary evidence about everyday business in most parts of the Empire, twelfth-century provincial administration is largely unrecorded. The absence of basic data on population, land holding, judicial proceedings, taxation, commercial activity, social relations, and so on severely limits the social historian. To rely only on records kept by officials in the capital produces merely an ideal picture, one negated by numerous protests and revolts against corrupt and inefficient administrators. Although complaints from the provinces are so common that they should not always be taken literally, it is clear that specific disorders provoked serious antagonism toward the capital. This must be related to the notional ideal of administration developed in Constantinople. Only by combining official sources with a thorough investigation of practical effects of provincial administration (however scrappily recorded) and of all local sources (however insufficient and unclear) can one begin to gain a wider picture of provincial reality. Even though local events are usually recorded by people educated at the capital, whose reports are inevitably biased toward the imperial ideal, this evidence can reveal several little-known aspects of provincial life: the interaction of different spheres of authority, the activities of administrators, civil, military, and ecclesiastical, nominated by Constantinople, the degree of local involvement in provincial government, and rural attitudes toward the capital. These aspects of provincial life suggest in particular that during the latter part of the twelfth century there was a significant change in provincial government. Constantinople failed to maintain administration, both military and civilian authorities transformed their appointed roles, the nature of their command altered. Only the ecclesiastical sector of imperial administration retained its coherence and given function. Through the new role imposed on it by failures in other sectors, it gained strength and became an outstanding force for the unity of the Empire at a time of disintegration and separatist movements.

While this pattern was fairly general, it took rather different forms in different parts of the Empire. For central Greece the position of the Church is especially highlighted in the letters of Michael Choniates, Metropolitan of Athens from 1182 to 1205.<sup>1</sup> His diocese formed part of the theme of Hellas and Peloponnesos, which had its own character defined by geographical and historical particularities. From its strategic position it served as a port of call for trade and as a base for negotiations between Constantinople and the West. Despite this geographical advantage, the area never rated very highly in military terms, nor did the theme enjoy a high status within Byzantine administration. Distance from the capital and rather poor resources reduced the desirability of appointments in Hellas and Peloponnesos. Both churchmen and civilian governors were hesitant to accept positions, but their reaction may be partly attributed to cosmopolitan distaste for the provinces.<sup>2</sup>

In the twelfth century, however, the region was by no means poverty-stricken. The seat of administration was at Thebes, a well-fortified city situated in the fertile Kephissos plain. Some of the finest Byzantine silks were woven and embroidered there by skilled craftsmen from the large Jewish community. Thebes also attracted a great number of foreign merchants and was the chosen residence of many landowners in central Greece.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, Athens was no longer the grand city of classical proportions, but a relatively small town based on the slopes of the Acropolis. The port facilities at Piraeus sustained some commercial life, but it was not a noted social or intellectual center. Unlike the well-watered areas of Boiotia, Euboia, and Thessaly, Attica was notoriously hot and dry. But the vine, olive, pistachio, and citrus fruits flourished in its stony, sandy soil. Overall the theme was self-sufficient in basic necessities, though they were considered primitive by Constantinopolitan standards.<sup>4</sup>

The theme of Hellas and Peloponnesos was created in the first half of the eleventh century when the two provinces were combined into one unit. It was administered by both military and civil appointees.<sup>5</sup> Among them Nikèphoros Botaneiatès, *prōtoproedros* and *doux* of Hellas and Peloponnesos, clearly re-

<sup>1</sup> Μιχαήλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ σωζόμενα, ed. S. Lampros, 2 vols. (Athens, 1878–80) (hereafter, *M. Ch.*, I and II [Michael Choniates in the text]). Cf. the critical notes by P. N. Papageorgiou, Ἐπὶ κρισὶς τῆς ἐκδόσεως τοῦ Μιχαήλ Ἀκομινάτου (Athens, 1883).

<sup>2</sup> J. Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikès. Lettres et Discours* (Paris, 1970), 124–25, letter 9; R. Browning, "Unpublished Correspondence between Michael Italicus, Archbishop of Philippopolis, and Theodore Prodromos," *Byzantinobulgarica*, 1 (1962), 279–97.

<sup>3</sup> Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. and trans. M. N. Adler (London, 1907), 10; N. Svoronos, "Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin et la fiscalité aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles: Le cadastre de Thèbes," *BCH*, 83 (1959), 36, 53, 71, 73–75; A. Lombardo and R. Morozzo della Rocca, *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI–XIII* (Turin, 1940), nos. 233–35, 239, 273–75, 353, 403; Nicetas Choniates, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1835) (hereafter, *N. Ch.*), 99–101, 608–9. It is most unfortunate that no records of provincial administration in Thebes survive.

<sup>4</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 11–12, 26–27, 42, 69; G. Stadtmüller, "Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen (ca. 1183–ca. 1222)," *OC*, 33 (1934) (hereafter, Stadtmüller, "Michael Choniates"), 125–325; K. Setton, "Athens in the Later Twelfth Century," *Speculum*, 19 (1944), 179–207; *idem*, "A Note on Michael Choniates, Archbishop of Athens (1182–1204)," *ibid.*, 21 (1946), 234–36.

<sup>5</sup> Hélène Glykatzi-Ahrweiler, "Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IX<sup>e</sup>–XI<sup>e</sup> siècles," *BCH*, 84 (1960), 76. Unification of provinces was not unusual at this time; further north, Strymon was joined to Boleron and Thessalonikè.



flected the former.<sup>6</sup> Another Nikèphoros, nicknamed Nikèphoritès because of his precocious career in the administration, held the three equivalent titles *dikastès*, *kritès*, and *praitôr*, all belonging to the civil sector of the Constantinopolitan bureaucracy.<sup>7</sup> However, as a result of the reforms—*ca.* 1094—of Alexios I, the *megas doux* (μέγας δούξ) took charge of all maritime parts of the Empire, including Hellas and Peloponnesos. To the most strategic he appointed subordinate officers as military governors (*doukes*).<sup>8</sup>

In this new arrangement the theme of Hellas and Peloponnesos held an anomalous position: it fell under the authority of the *megas doux*, but continued to be governed by a civilian official, *praitôr* (πραιτωρ). Some of these governors were drawn from the judiciary and were also known as *kritès*, while others held the title ἀνθύπατος (*anthypatos*, proconsul), which was often used in other European provinces in association with *pronoètès* and *praitôr*.<sup>9</sup> This was probably an honorific title; it had always been connected with the patriciate and it declined rapidly after Alexios I introduced a new hierarchy of titles.<sup>10</sup> While the *megas doux* remained in overall control, these civilian officials were nominated from Constantinople through other channels. Officers responsible for naval affairs were active in the province, and the *megas doux* could assert his authority within the province by a personal visit. But there is no evidence that governors were normally his appointees. Despite these regional particularities the area fell into the general pattern of twelfth-century military administration; it suffered the same stresses and pressures as other themes, and in this sense developments in Hellas and Peloponnesos can be seen as reflecting those of the whole Empire.

### THE HIERARCHY OF ADMINISTRATION

In order to examine the administrative structure of provincial government, the triad of military, civilian, and ecclesiastical sectors from the reforms of

<sup>6</sup> These titles are recorded on his seal; see A. Bon, *Le Péloponnèse byzantin jusqu'en 1204* (Paris, 1952), 200f., no. 53.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 200, no. 52; cf. Michael Attaliota, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1853), 182; G. G. Litavrin, *Sovety i rasskazy Kekaumena* (Moscow, 1972) (hereafter, *Kekaumenos*), 266; Michael Psellos, *Epistulae*, ed. K. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 5 (1876), 344; cf. Psellos, *Scripta minora*, eds. E. Kurtz and F. Drexler, II (Milan, 1941), letter 8, addressed to the same Nikèphoros, *sebastophoros*; Johannes Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, ed. L. Dindorf, IV (Leipzig, 1871), 219.

<sup>8</sup> On the post of *megas doux*, see R. Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* (Berlin/Amsterdam, 1967), I, 542–62; Hélène Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la Mer* (Paris, 1966) (hereafter, *Ahrweiler, La Mer*), 275–77; A. Hohlweg, *Beiträge zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des oströmischen Reiches unter den Komnenen*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia*, 1 (Munich, 1965) (hereafter, *Hohlweg, Verwaltungsgeschichte*), 134–57; N. Oikonomidès, “Les institutions, l’évolution de l’organisation administrative de l’empire byzantin au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle,” paper delivered at the “Table ronde sur le onzième siècle,” Paris, 1973 (publication forthcoming). I am most grateful to Professor Oikonomidès for allowing me to consult his paper and for many helpful references.

<sup>9</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 145, 177, 315, 338, and *passim*; N. Bănescu, “La signification des titres de πραιτωρ et de προνοητής à Byzance aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles,” *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, III (Vatican City, 1946) (= ST, 123), 387–98; Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions*, II, 68–79.

<sup>10</sup> When Michael Choniates recalled the fact that Alexios Komnènos held the title of *anthypatos*, he referred to his position as *megas doux*. It was in this capacity that Alexios governed Hellas and Peloponnesos; see *infra*, p. 281. On the new hierarchy, see Hohlweg, *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, 34–40.

Alexios I to the end of the twelfth century is plotted on a chart (following p. 284).<sup>11</sup> This is not at all complete, as is evident from many gaps; further research will certainly add many entries. However, it does correlate the different spheres of administration, and it emphasizes a basic feature which was to become most significant in the period: the relatively brief duration of civilian and military appointments in comparison to ecclesiastical. Following the chart, the three sectors will be discussed in sequence in order to contrast their specific characters, effectiveness, and particularly their relationship to each other. In this fashion it may be possible to elucidate some of the complexities of Byzantine provincial government in the twelfth century. Many remain, for it is the social and economic aspects of provincial life, from the level of external trade to the wealth and poverty of domestic existence, that provide the essential basis for any complete study of administration. But these lie beyond the scope of this article.

To emphasize the contrast between the three sectors of government, the order of the chart (see *supra*) is reversed in the following discussion: first, metropolitan administration, which presented the greatest continuity; second, the civilian sector; and third, the military/naval authority, which, although it was the most powerful, probably had the least influence in day-to-day matters of provincial government.

### METROPOLITAN ADMINISTRATION

Whatever the nominal control of the *megas doux* and the claims made by civil officials, ecclesiastical administration was probably the most efficient in the province. As Constantinople's grasp over the outlying regions of the Empire diminished through the twelfth century, churchmen increasingly took over the difficult task of maintaining imperial authority. They replaced weak and corrupt provincial governors as the main force for law and order, constituting the most reliable and immediate influence over local inhabitants. This development should be related to the ancient custom of the patriarchal defense of the capital in the emperor's absence. But in the provinces rather more decisive initiatives were sometimes called for. The examples of Michael Italikos, Nikètas of Chônai, and Eustathios of Thessalonikè indicate that Michael Choniates' defense of Athens under siege was by no means exceptional.<sup>12</sup> It was an action typical of concerned ecclesiastics throughout the Empire.

Unlike the other two sectors of administration, ecclesiastical government had always been based on the lengthy residence of metropolitans in provincial centers and on long continuous service by lesser officials. Although many churchmen preferred to spend as much time as possible in the capital, others

<sup>11</sup> This can be only in roughly chronological order, given the nature of some of the evidence.

<sup>12</sup> *N. Ch.*, 83–84, 254–57, 284, 800. On Patriarch Sergios' participation in the defense of Constantinople, see F. Barišić, "Le siège de Constantinople par les Avars et les Slaves en 626," *Byzantion*, 24 (1954), 378–89.

developed a proprietary concern for their dioceses and established a position of great personal authority there. Metropolitans held lifelong appointments and normally built up a good relationship with their provincial parishioners. In every major city they could be seen to represent the authority of the patriarch, of the Oecumenical Church, and of the emperor whose name was always mentioned in prayers and sermons. Whereas governors might change every three years or more frequently, or might be permanently absent—an unseen force—ecclesiastics embodied an element of continuity in provincial administration. During the twelfth century this factor took on new significance.

#### THE DIOCESE OF ATHENS

Under the metropolitan of Athens a large diocese extended over central Greece, bordering on those of Thebes and Neopatras (Νέαι Πάτραι) to the north, Naupaktos in the west, and Corinth to the south. Corinth retained the highest position as twenty-seventh in the hierarchy of metropolitan sees; Athens came next as twenty-eighth; then Naupaktos, thirty-fifth; Neopatras, fiftieth; and Thebes, fifty-seventh.<sup>13</sup> At the end of the twelfth century Athens had twelve suffragan sees of which the last two, "Kea kai Thermia" and Megara, were created in the course of that century, probably in response to a growing population.<sup>14</sup> In addition it controlled many important monasteries, Daphnè, Hosios Loukas, and Kaisareianè among them. Since its creation in 806 the metropolitan see of Athens had accumulated property beyond its diocesan boundaries and certainly appeared to Pope Innocent III as a wealthy see.<sup>15</sup> By Byzantine standards it did not compare favorably with major sees in Asia Minor; Theodore Pantechnès dissuaded George Tornikès from accepting the nomination to Corinth on these grounds.<sup>16</sup> Nonetheless, among European sees Athens was not that poor, as it owned estates (προόστεια) and properties, irrigated fields, ponds, mills, and gardens scattered through at least twenty-five villages. These possessions, recorded in official registers (πρακτικά), furnished the metropolitan with produce—honey from the monastery of Kaisareianè, corn from the region of Karystos in Euboea—and they brought in a certain amount of revenue.<sup>17</sup> All the clergy and provincial institutions under the metropolitan's authority also paid the ecclesiastical tax, κανονικόν. But undoubtedly the greatest privilege of Athens was the possession of an imperial chrysobull issued in the twelfth century, which particularly protected its

<sup>13</sup> The *Ordo ecclesiasticus* of Isaac II (1189) most accurately reflects these positions; see H. Gelzer, *Analecta byzantina* (Jena, 1892), I, 4.

<sup>14</sup> These are recorded in the *Notitia* partially published by H. Gelzer as *Notitia V*, from Athens, cod. gr. 1371, in *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum*, AbhBayer, Philos.-Philol.Kl., 21 (1901), 584. The two new suffragans are clearly visible on fol. 390r of the MS. For a detailed examination of this *Notitia*, see my study "The Diocese of Athens" (forthcoming).

<sup>15</sup> PL, 215, cols. 1559–62; V. Laurent, "L'érection de la Métropole d'Athènes et le statut ecclésiastique de l'Illyricum au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *EtByz*, 1 (1943), 58–78.

<sup>16</sup> See note 2 *supra*.

<sup>17</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 131, 210–11, 311; PL, 215, cols. 1559–62; cf. E. Herman, "The Secular Church," *CMH*, 4, pt. 2 (1967), 118–25.

church and lands from external pressures.<sup>18</sup> It specifically prevented the civil governor based in Thebes from making unsolicited visits to Athens, thereby confirming the undisputed authority of the metropolitan. This charter gave Athens privileges similar to those enjoyed by very few cities and churches—Ochrid and Corfù, for example.<sup>19</sup> In practice, however, the charter, though important, was a paper privilege, as the metropolitan was quite unable to enforce its terms: armed with soldiery and under the pretext of worshipping at the Parthenon church, governors continued to enter the city uninvited.

The duties of a metropolitan were basically fivefold: to manage the election of bishops and lesser clergy, to preach regularly in the metropolitan church, to ensure high standards of learning and discipline among the clergy and parish, to collect taxes destined for the patriarch, and to implement any decisions of the patriarch and synod affecting provincial churches. Naturally, the routine business of any metropolitan also included performing the ecclesiastical services associated with local births, marriages, deaths, and other events recorded in church registers, maintaining church property, settling disputes which fell under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and representing the patriarch in the province (or elsewhere) whenever necessary.<sup>20</sup> To carry out these services metropolitans employed a team of clerical officials modeled on the staff of the patriarch, ecclesiastical *archontes*.<sup>21</sup> From the ranks of these Constantinopolitan clerics many patriarchs and metropolitans were recruited; it was the most prestigious training ground.<sup>22</sup> The same pattern was often found in the provinces, although local *archontes* were usually less well educated and much less powerful. They regularly combined several offices and sometimes held part-time civilian jobs in addition to these clerical duties. The number of *archontes* and their efficiency varied considerably from one diocese to another; there was no uniformity.

In the twelfth century the diocese of Athens was governed by a series of very capable men, most of them trained at Constantinople in the patriarchal chancellery and fully aware of the methods and practices followed at the capital. George Bourtzès and Nikolaos Hagiotheodôritès, in particular, were familiar not only with patriarchal administration, but also with the non-ecclesias-

<sup>18</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 308; II, 71, 107; F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches* (Munich/Berlin, 1924–60) (hereafter, Dölger, *Regesten*), no. 1541.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, nos. 1285–88, 1541–46; P. Lemerle, "Trois actes du despote d'Épire Michel II concernant Corfou connus en traduction latine," Προσφορά εις Σ. Π. Κυριακίδην (= 'Ελληνικά, Suppl. 4 [1953]), 405–26, esp. 424; G. Brătianu, *Privilèges et franchises municipales dans l'Empire byzantin* (Bucharest, 1936), 104–14.

<sup>20</sup> E. Herman, "Appunti sul diritto metropolitano della chiesa bizantina," *OCP*, 13 (1947), 522–50; cf. *M. Ch.*, II, 75.

<sup>21</sup> J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les Ὀφφίκια de l'église byzantine* (Paris, 1970) (hereafter, Darrouzès, *Offikia*). This study has made several basic revisions to the older work of L. Clugnet, "Les offices et les dignités ecclésiastiques dans l'Eglise grecque," *ROChr*, 3 (1898), 142–50, 260–64, 452–57; *ibid.*, 4 (1899), 116–28.

<sup>22</sup> Twelfth-century patriarchs elected from the *archontes* included Nikètas Mountanès, Basileios Kamatèros, and George Xiphilinos. On the significance of the group, see V. Tiftixoglu, "Gruppenbildungen innerhalb des Konstantinopolitanischen Klerus während der Komnenenzeit," *BZ*, 62 (1969), 25–72, esp. 33–36, 53–60.

tical duties often demanded of metropolitans.<sup>23</sup> Michael Choniates fitted into this tradition perfectly. He had spent many years at the patriarchate, chiefly as secretary (ὑπογραμματεὺς), writing and editing material for speeches and orations. From this position he got to know the *archontes*, some of whom had a strong influence on him—Theodosios Boradiôtès (patriarch from 1178 to 1185), George Xiphilinos (*megas skeuophylax* and subsequently patriarch, 1191–98), Michael Autôreianos (patriarch at Nicaea after the fall of Constantinople), and particularly Eustathios Kataphlôrôn, his teacher who became metropolitan of Thessalonikè in 1175. He kept up a correspondence with many of them.<sup>24</sup>

Metropolitans of Athens officiated from the Acropolis using the converted Parthenon as the metropolitan church dedicated to the Mother of God. It formed an exceptionally large church, richly decorated and endowed by many benefactors, among them Basil II, the most celebrated of pilgrims to Athens.<sup>25</sup> For centuries it had commanded the services of a large clergy whose deaths were recorded in graffiti scratched on the original temple columns, for example Theodôros, monk and *skeuophylax* (died 1055); Iôannès, *prôtopapas* (1041), son of Pothos, *oikonomos*; Nikêtas, *presbyteros* (1072); Iôannès, *prôtopsaltès* (1063/64), and David, *domestikos* (1071). The columns of the Propylaia, walled up to form the metropolitan residence, also carry these coarse inscriptions.<sup>26</sup> On the edge of the ancient Agora, the Theseion, similarly converted into a church dedicated to St. George, seems to have provided additional assistants to metropolitans, such as one Leontios, probably secretary to Iôannès Blachernitès.<sup>27</sup> Local involvement in church matters was common throughout the Empire. In Athens the Pleuritès/Pleurès family was one of those which regularly committed members to ecclesiastical duties and to monasteries in the area.<sup>28</sup>

From writings dating after his appointment to Athens it appears that Michael Choniates inherited several assistants and maintained quite a large staff. The chief offices of *oikonomos*, *sakellarios*, *skeuophylax*, *chartophylax*, and *prôtekdikos* are mentioned, but not that of *sakelliou*.<sup>29</sup> Among the junior offices,

<sup>23</sup> J. Darrouzès, "Obit de deux Métropolités d'Athènes, Léon Xèros et Georges Bourtzès, d'après les inscriptions du Parthénon," *REB*, 20 (1962), 190–96; *idem*, "Notice sur Grégoire Antiochos (1160 à 1196)," *ibid.*, 79–80.

<sup>24</sup> On his training, see *M. Ch.*, I, 347–49; II, 8–10, 67. Altogether, six letters to Eustathios, six to Patriarch Theodosios, two to Xiphilinos, and seven to Autoreianos are preserved.

<sup>25</sup> A. Frantz, "From Paganism to Christianity in the Temples of Athens," *DOP*, 19 (1968), 185–206; A. D. Norre, *Studies in the History of the Parthenon* (Diss. Los Angeles, 1966), 1–43.

<sup>26</sup> On the Parthenon inscriptions, see A. K. Orlandos and L. Branouses, *Τὰ Χαραγμὰ τοῦ Παρθενῶνος* (Athens, 1973) (hereafter, *Charagmata*), nos. 56, 60, 217; for those on the Propylaia, Antonin, *O drevnih' hristsianskih' nadpisjah' v' Afinah'* (St. Petersburg, 1874), 33, no. 4; 35, no. 8.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 28, no. 29: Leontios died in 1078; Iôannès Blachernitès held office from 1068/69 to 1086.

<sup>28</sup> On the disagreement between the Pleuritès brothers, see Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikès* (note 2 *supra*), 126, no. 9; cf. *M. Ch.*, II, 290–91.

<sup>29</sup> The Athenian officials are recorded in *M. Ch.*, II, 30, 32, 138, 243–44, 290, 313, 318. On the division of the staff into groups or *pentades*, see Darrouzès, *Offikia*, 100–1. The five main *archontes*, called *exôkatakoiloi*, undertook the work of the patriarchate and provided a secretariat for the Holy Synod, the supreme authority of the Church; see S. Vailhé, "Le droit d'appel en Orient et le Synode de Constantinople," *EO*, 20 (1921), 129–46; J. Hajjar, "Le Synode permanent dans l'Eglise byzantine des origines au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle," *OCA*, 164 (1962); Tiftixoglu, *op. cit.*, 57; Darrouzès, *Offikia*, 334–36.

only those of *hypomnèmatographos* and of *repherendarios* are known.<sup>30</sup> Although it is not clear that these few offices were always filled, the team probably compared favorably with those of other sees. Euthymios Malakès mentions only one *chartoularios* and one deacon and *kouboukleisios* among his assistants at Neopatras.<sup>31</sup> The fact that several of the Athenian *archontes* are recorded after 1205 does not mean that the titles were necessarily honorary, for Michael Choniates' officials were active under the Frankish occupation. Orthodox clergy were by no means excluded from Greece by the Latin conquest even though their leaders were forced into exile.<sup>32</sup>

The activity of this provincial clergy is somewhat sketchily illustrated in Choniates' letters. But it is possible to reconstruct the roles of the chief officials. The *oikonomos* is mentioned only once in a letter to Manuel, metropolitan of Thebes, concerning a monastery called "tou Myrriniou" (or "tôn Myrriniôtôn") which may have been situated nearer Thebes than Athens. Michael writes that his official, the *megas oikonomos*, will be visiting the area to announce a synodal decision to those monasteries under the church of Athens.<sup>33</sup> As the *oikonomos* was normally responsible for financial matters, he would probably have collected rents, looked after the resources, and kept the accounts of the see. The post was usually reserved for deacons and was an important one for any see with property. Numerous graffiti indicate previous *oikonomoi* of Athens.<sup>34</sup>

Shortly after his arrival in Athens, Choniates was forced to explain his reasons for not granting the request of one of his deacons, Phôkas, to be promoted from *sakellarios* to *skeuphylax*. As *sakellarios* he would probably have been in charge of the chapels and monasteries in the diocese, and for their financial contribution to ecclesiastical funds.<sup>35</sup> The post of *skeuphylax* was more prestigious in that it involved custody of all the sacred vessels, liturgical books, and vestments which at Athens must have constituted a valuable treasury.<sup>36</sup> Phôkas, however, was elderly and blind, and as it was against canon law for a blind or deaf person to hold such a post, his request for promotion was firmly refused. Later the post of *sakellarios* was filled by Pleurès.<sup>37</sup> *Skeuphylakes* are often recorded in Parthenon graffiti, usually in connection with the diaconate, and sometimes held together with the post of first chanter (πρωτοψάλτης).<sup>38</sup>

Before the Latin conquest there is no evidence of a *chartophylax* of Athens, but at some time after his departure from the Acropolis Choniates appointed George Bardanès as *hypomnèmatographos*, assistant to an unidentified *charto-*

<sup>30</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 310; II, 284, 285, 314.

<sup>31</sup> Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη Μητροπολίτου Νέων Πατρῶν τὰ σωζόμενα, ed. K. G. Mponès, 2 vols. (Athens, 1937-49) (hereafter, *EM*, I and II) I, 51-52. For the clergy of the metropolitan of Smyrna, cf. Hélène Ahrweiler, "La région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques, 1081-1317," *TM*, 1 (1965) (hereafter, Ahrweiler, "Smyrne"), 102-4, 118-21.

<sup>32</sup> The posts of *chartophylax*, *prōtekdikos*, and *hypomnèmatographos* are mentioned only after 1205.

<sup>33</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 138; cf. Ahrweiler, "Smyrne," 111 note 177, on the epithet *megas*.

<sup>34</sup> *Charagmata*, nos. 169, 188, 219, 221.

<sup>35</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 30-34; Darrouzès, *Offikia*, 310-14.

<sup>36</sup> Darrouzès, *Offikia*, 312-18; *M. Ch.*, I, 103-4, 325; II, 27.

<sup>37</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 290-91.

<sup>38</sup> *Charagmata*, nos. 38, 64, 87, 172, 192, 213, etc.

*phylax*.<sup>39</sup> George, the son of Dēmētrios, bishop of Karystos, was a pupil of Michael in Athens, and became a great friend. The anonymous *chartophylax* whom George had to assist was clearly a mutual friend who failed to organize the transport of wheat and barley harvested from estates in Euboia belonging to Athens to the island of Kea, where the metropolitan had established his exile. Evidently Michael was dissatisfied with his official and asked George and his father to help, instructing that as much grain as could be carried by boat should be sent and the rest be sold. As *hypomnēmatographos* George was expected to assist the *chartophylax* in issuing and countersigning documents, keeping metropolitan records, including the register of births, marriages, and deaths, and looking after the library.<sup>40</sup> Choniates loved books and constantly desired to add to his collection; he himself had made a copy of Theophylact's exegesis on the Epistles of St. Paul and expected his pupils to do likewise.<sup>41</sup> It was possibly under Michael's orders that the *Synodikon* of Athens was brought up to date; in the form in which it survives, it concludes with the death of Metropolitan Nikolaos Hagiotheodōritēs in 1175.<sup>42</sup>

It is difficult to illustrate the exact role of *chartophylax* from George's activity, because he was promoted to that position in new and delicate circumstances created by the Frankish occupation.<sup>43</sup> Michael expected George to keep him informed of all developments on the mainland and to represent him abroad. But he realized the problems of working under foreign domination and eventually transferred George to the bishopric of Grevena, south of Kastoria. The *chartophylax* finally relinquished his title on his election to the see of Kerkyra (Corfu) in 1219.<sup>44</sup> By then Michael had given up his skeletal administrative staff and had retired to the Prodromos monastery at Bodonitza near Thermopylai. In his old age he was only anxious to obtain good positions for his pupils in the flourishing Orthodox communities at Nicaea and in Epiros.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>39</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 243–44. The first occasion on which George is addressed as *hypomnēmatographos* occurs later: *ibid.*, II, 284.

<sup>40</sup> On the importance of the *chartophylax* and his assistants, see Darrouzès, *Offikia*, 334–53; Tiftixoglou, *op. cit.* (note 22 *supra*), 56ff. One Theodēgios, father of Philippos, metropolitan in the tenth century, held the position; see *Charagmata*, no. 61.

<sup>41</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 206, 242. On the metropolitan's library, see S. Lampros, Περὶ τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Μητροπολίτου Ἀθηνῶν Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου, in Ἀθηναῖον, 6 (1877/78), 354–67. Copyists were certainly available, for Athens was the home of Kōnstantinos Tarsitēs, scribe of a MS dated 1129, and copying went on in the monastery of Hosios Meletios; see M. Vogel and V. Garthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Leipzig, 1909), 28, 242, 251.

<sup>42</sup> On the *Synodikon*, see V. Laurent, "La liste épiscopale de la Métropole d'Athènes, d'après le Synodicon d'une de ses églises suffragantes," *Mémorial L. Petit* (Bucharest, 1948). Choniates' role is suggested: *ibid.*, 276 note 3.

<sup>43</sup> The creation of a rival ecclesiastical organization forced Choniates into self-imposed exile on the island of Kea, one of his suffragan sees. Although the Latin clergy were instructed to be tolerant and only one bishop in central Greece accepted the leadership of Bérard, the first Latin archbishop of Athens, Greek monasteries were put under considerable pressure; see R. L. Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261: Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest," *Traditio*, 6 (1948), 33–60; and the letters of Innocent III, PL, 215, cols. 959, 1030–31, 1141–66.

<sup>44</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 257, 285–89, 311–13, 314–18, 334; cf. Stadtmüller, "Michael Choniates," 204–5; Wolff, *op. cit.*, 40; V. G. Vasil'evskij, "Epirotica saeculi XIII, iz' perepiski Ioanna Navpaktskago," *VizVrem*, 3 (1896), nos. 5, 6, 9–13, 248–52, 254–63.

<sup>45</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 337, 350.

The last office in the group of chief *archontes* was that of *prôtekdikos*, again recorded by Michael only in the context of Latin occupation. The official, Orphanos, wished to join the monastery of Hosios Meletios and his application was supported by the metropolitan.<sup>46</sup> At Constantinople the *prôtekdikos* was the first of several judges (ἐκδικοί) presiding over a special public tribunal for criminals who sought religious asylum.<sup>47</sup> Provincial *prôtekdikoi* probably had a comparable judicial function, though this is not well illustrated by the few sources.<sup>48</sup>

The junior *archontes* of the capital were divided into a group of four who assisted in the work of the *chartophylakion* of the patriarch and into another separate group connected with other aspects of administration.<sup>49</sup> In the provinces their counterparts appear rarely and have a less well defined role. Of those attached to the *chartophylax* of Athens, only the *hypomnèmatographos* is mentioned by Choniates, but provincial *hieromnèmones* and *logothetai* are known elsewhere.<sup>50</sup> The other junior staff seem to act as general assistants and scribes, but they are not recorded in Athens. The one reference to a *repherendarios* is certainly to the patriarchal official from Constantinople. He is associated with another high-ranking figure from the capital, the *mystikos*, a civilian officer, and both are accused of plundering and ruining Athens.<sup>51</sup> Among various clerics definitely attached to the Metropolitan church there were several concerned with liturgical matters, *domestikoi* and *deutereuontes*, and chanters, *psaltai*; others were involved more in administration, including scribes and recorders (*chartoularioi*), among them lay officials (*kouratores*). But most of them were deacons and monks.<sup>52</sup> Shortly before Michael's arrival in Athens, Kosmas Kampokilos, *chartoularios* of the metropolitan, had died.<sup>53</sup> The unfamiliar patronyms of these officials confirm their local origin—Oxeidas, Tyropoulès, Leichènarès, Mamounès, Syleôtès, and Chrysochos (from the Parthenon), and Satôreianos and Kampokilos (from the Propylaia).<sup>54</sup> When taken together with the few patrons whose names are preserved in Athenian churches, for

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 313.

<sup>47</sup> Darrouzès, *Offikia*, 323–32. In the Great Church there was a particular spot where this tribunal met, and a shrine reserved for murderers: *N. Ch.*, 446.

<sup>48</sup> See, for example, Nikolaos *presbyteros*, *prôtekdikos*, and *nomikos* of the bishop of Hierissos in 1071: *Actes de Lavra. Première partie des origines à 1204*, ed. P. Lemerle et al., Archives de l'Athos, V (Paris, 1970) (hereafter, *Actes de Lavra*, I), no. 35.

<sup>49</sup> See note 40 *supra*.

<sup>50</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 284; cf. the *hypomnèmatographos* of the metropolitan of Thessalonikè: *Actes de Lavra*, I, no. 64. Provincial *hieromnèmones* are known in the area: *ibid.*, nos. 22, 47; *Actes de Xéropotamou*, ed. J. Bompaire, Archives de l'Athos, III (Paris, 1963), no. 7; and a *logothetès*: F. Miklosich and J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana* (Vienna, 1860–90) (hereafter, *MM*), VI, 99.

<sup>51</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 310; cf. II, 125, where the *mystikos*' agent, *hypodrèstèr*, is connected with further depredations. Stadtmüller, "Michael Choniates," 296–97, corrects "dephendarios" to "repherendarios," but identifies the official as one attached to Athens. The *mystikos* was one of the most influential figures in the imperial chancellery; see R. Guiland, "Le mystique," *REB*, 26 (1968), 279–96; Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1550. There is no suggestion that provincial *mystikoi* ever existed. The activity of these officials in Attica may be related to the appearance of the emperor's brothers-in-law, particularly Stryphnos: *M. Ch.*, II, 98–100, 125.

<sup>52</sup> *Charagmata*, nos. 78, 129, 186, 191, 229 (*chartoularioi*); 170, 192 (*prôtopsaltai*); 60, 141, 146 (*domestikoi*); 102 (*deutereuôn*); 184 (*kouratôr*); cf. *M. Ch.*, II, 137.

<sup>53</sup> Antonin, *op. cit.* (note 26 *supra*), 35, no. 12; cf. 36, no. 17.

<sup>54</sup> *Charagmata*, nos. 14, 132, 199, 42, 43, 17, 19; Antonin, *op. cit.*, 35–36.



example Nikolaos Kalommalos, founder of the church of SS. Theodore, and Germanos Sporgitès who restored the Prodomos church, devout but otherwise quite unknown families begin to take on real flesh and blood.<sup>55</sup>

Finally, Michael Choniates had two secretaries who probably filled the role of additional scribes in the metropolitan administration. Nikolaos Antiocheitès may well have been recruited in the province to be secretary for local affairs.<sup>56</sup> For the vital task of messenger Michael had a trusted *grammatikos*, Thomas, clearly a devoted friend also, who carried bundles of letters from Athens to the capital and back even after 1205.<sup>57</sup>

With this relatively small staff Choniates ran the see of Athens. As its possessions were scattered all over central Greece, the metropolitan was often in touch with other ecclesiastics. A long and interesting correspondence with Euthymios Malakès at Neopatras was provoked by the behavior of Balsam, bishop of Euripos, the first suffragan see of Athens.<sup>58</sup> Michael also used to consult the metropolitan of Thebes when he needed the governor's advice. Despite its proximity no correspondence between Athens and Corinth is recorded, though Michael noted with horror Metropolitan Nikolaos' death at Sgouros' hands.<sup>59</sup> Similarly, there is no evidence of contact with Larissa, and it was only after 1205 that Michael began to communicate with Iôannès Apokaukos of Naupaktos.<sup>60</sup>

Matters of discipline lay behind the relatively few letters to suffragan bishops and diocesan monasteries.<sup>61</sup> Only with Dèmètrios of Karystos was there an immediate link through his son, George Bardanès. Other bishops may have visited Athens from time to time, but they are not mentioned by the metropolitan. It was not until the period of foreign domination, when Michael was forced to write to his abbots and to support them against Frankish pressures, that he developed a close relationship with some.<sup>62</sup> This minimal contact with subordinate institutions before 1205 may be due to the fact that Michael came to know his diocese and its population through his officials who were sent on particular missions. He must have met local people and visitors from

<sup>55</sup> V. Laurent, "Nicolas Kalommalos et l'église des SS. Théodore à Athènes," *Ἑλληνικά*, 7 (1934), 72–82; K. Konstantopoulos, "Επιγραφή ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου Μαγκούπη," in *Ἑπ. Ἐτ. Βυλ. Σπ.*, 8 (1931), 247.

<sup>56</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 36, cf. 136–37. Nikolaos may possibly have been related to Ἐσαίας, the holy man who lived near Monemvasia.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 96, 98, 100, 106, 109, 237; the title of respect "entimôtatos" was always used for Thomas. The metropolitan of Thebes also had a secretary: *ibid.*, II, 199–200. Other *grammatikoi* of Athens included George the *presbyteros* (see *Charagmata*, no. 54) and Leontios (see note 27 *supra*).

<sup>58</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 26–30; *EM*, I, no. 34; cf. V. Grumel, *Les registres des Actes du patriarchat de Constantinople*, I, fasc. 3 (Paris, 1947), no. 1164. Michael had to call a local synod in Euboea, where he delivered a long sermon and settled the problem; see *M. Ch.*, I, 180–86.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 137, 170.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 281–82, 330–32, 332–33, etc.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 119–20 (mention of the bishop of Daulia and monastic communities in his see), 128, 198, 205–6, 207–10, 295, 308, etc. One stray letter to Epiphanius, bishop of Gardikion and Peristera, suffragan sees of Larissa, makes a specific request for the help of workmen not available in Athens; it has no ecclesiastical purpose: *ibid.*, II, 69.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 148–49, 155–57, 272–73, 313–14 (monastery of Hosios Meletios); 247–48 (monastery of the Philosophers); 252–57, 261–63 (monastery of the Confessors); 311–13 (Kaisareianè); and many others.

further afield who came on pilgrimages to the Church of the Theotokos, and all those who petitioned him for assistance or who found their way into the ecclesiastical courts. Through his preaching and catechisms he became known as a teacher—he probably had other pupils besides Georges Bardanès and the Hagiosophitai, a group of deacons from the capital.<sup>63</sup> The affectionate correspondence he maintained with local inhabitants, doctors, and friends suggests that he was held in high esteem in Hellas and Peloponnesos.<sup>64</sup>

No doubt the charitable organizations of the Church locked the metropolitan into a very close contact with people in the diocese, but it is clear that Michael also tried to understand and to relieve particular problems of the locality. Even though his letters to influential contacts in Constantinople may not always have produced the desired effect, people in the capital were certainly kept aware of Athens' difficulties. The fact that Michael took the initiative in beating off Sgouros' attack on the city illustrates his total involvement in provincial life, his commitment to his parish as well as to the emperor, and his concomitant influence in regional life.<sup>65</sup>

### CIVILIAN ADMINISTRATION

In contrast to the administration of the Orthodox Church, that of the imperial bureaucracy was, by the late twelfth century, no longer functioning as planned. Positions in public service were frequently bought, sold, and transferred through dowries and legacies. The wealthiest provincial families competed for posts in the central administration which guaranteed a place in the court hierarchy, while the less well-to-do sought sinecures at the local level. Although the sale of public appointments was traditional, twelfth-century practice failed notably to ensure the participation of suitable candidates. This undoubtedly contributed to the feebleness of the administration.<sup>66</sup>

Civilian officials were nonetheless responsible for the basic running of Hellas and Peloponnesos. The governor (*praitôr*) was appointed from Constantinople in the same way as the *doukes* of Asia Minor, normally for a three-year period. Many, however, did not take up the post; they simply directed provincial administration from the capital, becoming in effect absentee governors. This development drastically weakened the contact between capital and province, and increased the autonomy of local subaltern agents. Most of the twelfth-century governors of Hellas and Peloponnesos were drawn from established government circles of the capital. Kônstantinos Choïrosphaktès, Basileios

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 221–34, and many other letters to these three, Euthymios Tornikès, Nikolaos Pisto-philos, and Manuel Beriboès.

<sup>64</sup> Michael wrote frequently to Nikolaos Kalodoukès and Geörgios Kallistos, his doctors; e.g., *ibid.*, II, 147, 201; to local friends such as Manuel Yalas, Iôannès Kalokairos, and Dèmètrios Makrembolitès, see *ibid.*, II, 244, 249, 275; and to wives and widows of friends, *ibid.*, II, 332–33, 338.

<sup>65</sup> *N. Ch.*, 800–2.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 584, 598–600, 637–39; Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1165; P. Lemerle, "'Roga' et rente d'état," *REB*, 25 (1967), 97–100.

Xèros, and Epiphánios Kamatèros also had local connections, but their families were based at Constantinople and their relatives held important functions beyond the provincial boundaries. Others were recruited from the judiciary, for example Serblias and Tripsychos.<sup>67</sup> Of the eighteen governors, thirteen were quite clearly from a civilian background. Three held the post of *megas doux* coterminously, while the remaining two may have been associated with this office. But the great majority was not in any way connected with the highest naval authority.

Despite the nominal authority of the *megas doux*, there can be no doubt of the *praitôr*'s extraordinarily wide powers. He controlled the entire area "from Tempe to Sparta" and governed in just the same way as a *doux kai anagrapheus* of Asian themes.<sup>68</sup> During the eleventh century the commuting of services and concomitant decline of provincial troops meant that most local administrative work was reduced to its financial aspects, which could be covered by tax farmers.<sup>69</sup> To facilitate the collection of new taxes that replaced such former services as the provision of horses for the imperial post and supplies of food for local garrisons, numerous fiscal agents were sent from Constantinople or recruited on the spot. This slow process permitted a concentration of economic affairs in the hands of the governor. From his residence in Thebes he controlled all aspects of taxation, the judiciary, the local economy, and provincial defense (now rather limited). It was within his effective power to raise or lower the rate of tax levies, to exercise his right to personal services and transportation, and to ignore ecclesiastical privileges. In addition, it was also possible for him to effect real improvements in provincial life, but these are rarely noted.<sup>70</sup>

This extensive authority can be illustrated by the program of reform drawn up during the brief reign of Andronikos I to correct abuses in provincial government. Firstly, and most significantly, governors were to be selected on their merits and suitability. Secondly, they were to be adequately paid. These two provisions constituted a major change from the normal practice of appointing favored friends to unsalaried posts—the candidate earned his income in whatever way he could—or of permitting governorships to be sold to the highest bidder.<sup>71</sup> Thus in Hellas and Peloponnesos, special new measures were taken: a new tax register (κατάστιχον) based on an up-to-date survey of provincial landholdings and tax records was made. But when the governor issued an order (δρισμός) authorizing its use, the bureaucrats at Constantinople refused to validate it. So taxes continued to be assessed at the previous in-

<sup>67</sup> On these governors, see chart (following p. 284), notes 15, 22, 16, 20, and page 269 *infra*.

<sup>68</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 177.

<sup>69</sup> P. Lemerle, "Recherches sur le régime agraire à Byzance: la terre militaire à l'époque des Comnènes," *CahCM*, 2 (1959), 265–81.

<sup>70</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 307–11; II, 54, 65–66, 81–84, 106–7. Among the governor's personal services there was a special tax, παρατωρική ἐπὶ ἥρεια: *ibid.*, I, 308. He also controlled the minting of coinage at a local mint which was established, probably at Thebes, in the course of the twelfth century; see M. F. Hendy, *Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire 1081–1261*, DOS, XII (1969), 128–30.

<sup>71</sup> *N. Ch.*, 426; C. M. Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 61–66.

correct rate. Another reform was sabotaged, this time by local chicanery. A general remission of outstanding taxes (ἐκκοπή) had been issued at the accession of Alexios II, probably by Andronikos acting as Regent. While Euripos and Corinth apparently benefited from this event, Athens was excluded. So Choniates felt that his parishioners were being singled out for rough treatment, both in the province and at the capital.<sup>72</sup> His analysis of the situation is instructive: he accuses Choumnos, *chartoularios* of one of the Constantinopolitan bureaus, of deliberately wrecking the reform by refusing to validate the new *katastichon*. In addition, Choniates characterizes this attitude as typical of a *praktôr*, thereby suggesting that it was those officials who were the real villains of provincial affairs.<sup>73</sup> Any improvements that might be made at the local level were without legal standing until authorized by Constantinople. But Athens had friends neither at home nor at the center of government.

The first two governors appointed by Andronikos, Nikèphoros Prosouch and Dèmètrios Drimys, were nonetheless able to effect some improvements. Difficulties increased when Drimys preferred to remain at the capital rather than to serve a second term of office, thus abandoning the administration to junior agents, *praktores* and *anagrapheis*, who ran things according to their own interests.<sup>74</sup> Later the situation deteriorated yet further when an *antipraitôr*, an interim or substitute governor, was sent out from the capital. This official brought nothing but destruction to the province, levying irregular taxation three times in one year.<sup>75</sup> The metropolitan begged a friend at Constantinople to ensure that a proper governor be sent, hoping to revive the administration of Prosouch and Drimys. Such were the miseries of misgovernment that the period of Andronikos' rule seemed virtually halcyon by comparison, despite that Emperor's brief and unpopular reign.

His successors, Isaac II and Alexios III, did nothing to check the decline in provincial administration.<sup>76</sup> Two governors of this period, 1185 to 1203, are

<sup>72</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 48, 54. It was customary for emperors to grant a general remission of outstanding taxes at the outset of their reign. Individuals could also gain a specific, smaller exemption; see *Epistoliers byzantins du X<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris, 1960), 377, no. 47.

<sup>73</sup> This official should probably be identified with Theodôros Choumnos who was active in the imperial chancellery at this time; cf. *Actes de Lavra*, I, no. 66 (1184); J. Verpeaux, "Note prosopographique sur la famille Choumnos," *Byzantinoslavica*, 20 (1959), 252–54. In a previous letter, Michael mentioned the same Choumnos as a very powerful person who might be able to help: *M. Ch.*, II, 43.

<sup>74</sup> Nikèphoros Prosouch was welcomed by Michael with a long speech. He appears to have been an efficient governor; see *ibid.*, I, 142–49; II, 54, 66. He may be the same Nikèphoros Prosouch who was ambassador and adviser to Manuel I at the time of the Third Crusade; see Joannes Cinnamos, *Epitome*, Bonn ed. (1836), 33–35, 51; *N. Ch.*, 71, 88. In this case he would have been an old man in 1182. Despite this gap of nearly forty years, Lampros supported the identification: *M. Ch.*, II, 455; cf. Bon, *Le Péloponnèse* (note 6 *supra*), 201, no. 54. Drimys was obviously a younger man making a legal career. Michael addressed him as *dikastès* and *prôtoasèkrètis*: *M. Ch.*, I, 157–79; II, 66, 81–84. In 1186 he held the post of *kritès tou bèlou*; see *MM*, VI, 121.

<sup>75</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 65–66; the *antipraitôr* had the same role as a *hypodoux* in twelfth-century Thessalonikè, or a thirteenth-century *antidoux*; see Eustathios of Thessalonikè, *De simulatione*, PG, 136, col. 376; Ahrweiler, "Smyrne," 161, 163. They all served as substitutes before the arrival of nominated officials; cf. the *hypopraktôr* mentioned by Eustathios, *loc. cit.*

<sup>76</sup> *N. Ch.*, 584, 599, 639–40. Nikètas' accusation that the Aggeloi were totally unconcerned about the public good and interested only in accumulating taxes is borne out by his brother, who condemns the policy of draining the provinces of wealth: *M. Ch.*, II, 83.

known: Nikolaos Tripsychos, *prōtonotarios* of one of the departments of the central administration, and Kōnstantinos Maurikas, possibly *praitōr* in 1198; other *praitores* remain anonymous.<sup>77</sup> At the beginning of the period Tripsychos was awaited with great anticipation. Choniates was unable to greet him personally as one of his nephews had recently been wounded by pirates (an indication of the decline in local defense). The new governor had a suitable training, and swiftly rose in the judicial administration at Constantinople to become *dikaiodotēs* and *megas logariastēs tōn sekretōn* by 1196. Unfortunately there is no account of his presumably brief stay in Hellas and Peloponnesos.

By 1198 the situation in Athens had become so desperate that the metropolitan submitted a Memorandum (ὑπομνηστικόν) to Alexios III on the irregularities and abuses perpetrated by governors. At the same time he so informed several friends at the capital in very bitter terms, urging them to intervene.<sup>78</sup> Not only were provincial inhabitants subjected to excessive taxation and demands for all kinds of services, but, in addition, the governor had flaunted the chrysobull which protected Athens from his devastating visits. Under the guise of worshiping at the church of the Theotokos, he had stripped the city of supplies, requisitioned the domestic animals, and refused to leave until special money gifts were made. Governmental response to the metropolitan's outrage probably took the form of an official visit by the *logothetēs*, Basileios Kamatēros, the Emperor's brother-in-law.<sup>79</sup> Michael was gratified that such an influential public figure from the capital should see at first hand the plight of the Athenians, but apart from the speech of welcome nothing is recorded about the visit.

Other local officials continued to cause the metropolitan grave problems. From repeated though more muted complaints, and from the spread of revolts against central authority in the Argolis, Sparta, and Thessaly, it is evident that by the close of the century provincial government had seriously disintegrated. Where there was no firm control, independent forces were taking over. Such movements as those led by Sgouros, Chrysos, and Chamaretos were common in the Asian provinces of the Empire as well.<sup>80</sup> Constantinople's complete failure to maintain imperial administration in Hellas and Peloponnesos through its governors was finally illustrated by the crusaders' easy advance into

<sup>77</sup> See chart (after p. 284), notes 28, 29. The metropolitan addressed Tripsychos as *hypertimos*, not an exclusively ecclesiastical title, and as "*megalyperochos prōtonotarios*": *ibid.*, II, 67–68; cf. *Actes de Laura*, I, nos. 67, 68. His position as *praitōr* is also recorded on his seal; see N. Bees, "Zur Sigillographie der byzantinischen Themen Hellas und Peloponnesos," *VizVrem*, 21 (1914), 205–6.

<sup>78</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 307–11; but see the new edition and commentary by Stadtmüller, "Michael Choniates," 286–305. The accompanying letters went to Dēmētrios Tornikēs, the Belissariōtai, Theodōros Eirēnikos, and Stryphnos: *M. Ch.*, II, 96, 98–101, 102–4, 105–7.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 312–23. On Basileios Kamatēros, see R. Guiland, "Les logothètes," *REB*, 29 (1971), 62–63. Michael had written to him on his return from exile after the death of Andronikos in 1185 (*M. Ch.*, II, 62–64), but as with so many officials at the capital it is difficult to tell whether Michael knew him personally or not. In this case there may well have been a personal friendship dating from the days of Michael's training in Constantinople. Nikētas addressed three letters to the same Basileios; see J.-L. van Dieten, *Nicetae Choniatae orationes et epistolae* (Berlin/New York, 1972), 202–3, 209–11, 216–17.

<sup>80</sup> See J. Hoffmann, *Rudimente von Territorialstaaten im byzantinischen Reich (1071–1210)*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia*, 17 (Munich, 1974), 47–60, 90–96.

Greece. From Thessalonikè to Lakedaimonia the sole organized opposition was offered by groups of individuals and by city communities with defensible fortifications.<sup>81</sup> There was no trace of either provincial militia or of naval forces under the *praitôr*'s control.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

The chief function of twelfth-century provincial officials was to ensure the collection of taxes; they were also expected to keep order and to provide continuity of imperial control. Some were nominated like the governor from Constantinople: for example, the *anagrapheus* held a three year term of office; others were chosen by the governor, and junior clerks were probably recruited in the province to serve on a more permanent basis.<sup>82</sup> Tenth-century provincial financial administration was altered both as a result of changes in the central bureaucracy effected by Alexios I, and by the growth of civilian power in the provinces. While some posts disappeared altogether, others were combined in a simplified titlature, but functions remained almost unchanged.<sup>83</sup>

The *praktôr*. Of the many fiscal agents the *praktôr* gradually became the most powerful, taking over responsibility for assessing and organizing the collection of regular taxes, the land tax (*ἀκρόστιχον*), and irregular services (*ἐπὶ ῥῆσαι*).<sup>84</sup> The development of this office occurred at a time when all landowners, military, civilian, and ecclesiastical, were trying to extend their possessions and to obtain tax exemptions for them. Disputes over boundaries, over the services of dependent peasantry attached to landed estates, over the use of water mills and pastures, became extremely common. In all these matters the local *praktôr* often had a key role, one which is well illustrated in Michael Choniates' letters. This official had control over the establishment of taxes in central Greece and was thus in a position to perpetuate an unfair distribution which favored the wealthy. With this authority consecutive *praktores* rated Attica more highly

<sup>81</sup> Local *archontes*, such as Sgouros, Chalkoutzès, Doxapatrès, and Chamaretos, and walled cities like Larissa and Acrocorinth were able to resist the Crusaders, but many in fact welcomed the Latins as a relief from Byzantine rule; see J. Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris, 1949), 69–75.

<sup>82</sup> Ahrweiler, "Recherches sur l'administration" (note 5 *supra*), 68–69, 71–72, 75. *Anagrapheis* in the province of Strymon, Boleron, and Thessalonikè appear to have served slightly less than the three-year term in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; see *Actes de Lavra*, I, 220–22.

<sup>83</sup> An ideal account of this system is given in a tenth-century document; see F. Dölger, *Beiträge zur byzantinischen Finanzverwaltung, besonders des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1927; repr. Hildesheim, 1960) (hereafter cited as Dölger, *Finanzverwaltung*). In the twelfth century the title of *prōtonotarios* was reserved for heads of the chief departments of central administration; those of *epoptès* and *exisôtès* were generally combined with the office of *anagrapheus*. Judicial and recording functions of the old *dioikêtès* and *chartoularios* passed to the governor. On the reorganization, see E. Stein, "Untersuchungen zur spätbyzantinischen Verfassungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte," *Mitt IÖG*, 2 (1923–25), 33–34; Dölger, *Finanzverwaltung*, 15, 17–19; Oikonomidès, paper cited in note 8 *supra*.

<sup>84</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 307, 310; II, 66, 96, 99, 106f.; *Kekaumenos* (note 7 *supra*), 152, 296; Zepos, *Jus*, I, 363f.; Dölger, *Finanzverwaltung*, 71–73; Ahrweiler, "Recherches sur l'administration," 88, 90.

than neighboring regions, and failed to apply the new *katastichon* which would have corrected such abuses.<sup>85</sup> The *praktorikè energieia* was also responsible for many typical acts of rapaciousness and greed condemned by Michael Choniates.<sup>86</sup> From Athens he identified these officials as “destroyers of the poor,” and singled out the exorbitant demands of Tessarakontapèchys, *praktôr* in 1182, as particularly evil.<sup>87</sup> The prominence of the post is confirmed by the titles of a provincial governor, *doux kai praktôr* of Thessalonikè, who presided over a dispute between some soldiers and the monastery of Lavra.<sup>88</sup>

The *anagrapheus*. Closely connected with the *praktores*, the *anagrapheus* assumed the duty of land measurement and assessment, which was the basis of regular taxation, and in particular the calculation of *epibolè*, which established the rate of taxation on scattered, uncultivated, and partially exempt lands.<sup>89</sup> As measuring techniques were notoriously inefficient, whatever method was used, these officials were often accused of cheating. They were also in charge of the provincial register, which gave them opportunities to favor their friends, for example in the registration of tax exemptions.<sup>90</sup> Michael Choniates records one striking example of this activity. The entire village of Ôrôpos, an estate and a church which formed part of the ἀθηναϊκὴ ἐπίσκεψις, was registered in the *praktika* of Thebes. The officials responsible for this attempt to impoverish Athens were the *anagrapheus* Geôrgios Kolymbas, and his assistant (σύντροφος), Sergios Nomikopoulos.<sup>91</sup> From other accusations leveled against Kolymbas—failure to protect the Isthmus inhabitants against pirates, and corruption in public courts of justice—it appears that he may have been acting as governor. The combination of titles, *praitôr kai anagrapheus*, is recorded elsewhere; it clearly indicates even wider powers.<sup>92</sup> But perhaps Choniates was just pouring out his anger and despair over the state of public disorders at agents whom he already suspected.

<sup>85</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 307–8, II, 54.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 308; II, 42, 48, 54. Cf. the excessive *epêreiai* levied by *praktores* and their harassment of rich monastic communities: *Actes de Lavra*, I, no. 43; *MM*, VI, 55–57, 57–58; PG, 126, col. 316A. On one occasion, the entire rural population of the theme of Nikopolis revolted against its *praktôr*, Îdunnès Koutzomytès; see Georgius Cedrenus, *Synopsis historiarum*, Bonn ed. (1838–39), II, 529.

<sup>87</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 146; II, 48. In his editorial comments, Lampros indicates a marginal note in the Laurentianus MS which identifies Tessarakontapèchys: *ibid.*, II, 457. He should not be confused with Geôrgios Tessarakontapèchys, correspondent and friend of the metropolitan; see *ibid.*, II, 16, 17, 23, 43–46.

<sup>88</sup> *Actes de Lavra*, I, no. 64; cf. D. Polemis, *The Doukai* (London, 1968), 76, no. 30.

<sup>89</sup> Several documents refer precisely to this control over *epibolè* (ἐπιβολή): see *Actes de Lavra*, I, nos. 50, 52; cf. N. Svoronos, “L’épibolè à l’époque des Comnènes,” *TM*, 3 (1968), 375–95; E. Schilbach, *Byzantinische Metrologie* (Munich, 1970), 248–63. On the establishment of a land register (*praktikon*), see C. Astruc, “Un document inédit de 1165 sur l’évêché thessalien de Stagoi,” *BCH*, 83 (1959), 213–15.

<sup>90</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 307; II, 66. Cf. PG, 126, col. 448C; Schilbach, *op. cit.*, 244–48.

<sup>91</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 129–31. On the use of *episkepsis* as estate, see Dölger, *Finanzverwaltung*, 41, 151; there were imperial and personal as well as ecclesiastical estates: *MM*, VI, 131; *Actes de Xéropotamou*, no. 8. Lampros’ identification of Geôrgios Kolymbas with Sergios Kolybas, an imperial secretary and *prôtonotarios* active in 1192, is merely hypothetical; see *M. Ch.*, II, 599; F. Dölger, *Byzantinische Diplomatik* (Ettal, 1956), 31.

<sup>92</sup> *Actes d’Esphigmenou*, ed. J. Lefort, Archives de l’Athos, VI (Paris, 1973), no. 5; Bănescu, “La signification des titres” (note 9 *supra*), 392.

The titles of *anagrapheus* and *apographeus* were generally interchangeable in twelfth-century terminology, certainly for the governors of the Asia Minor themes.<sup>93</sup> Michael Choniates, however, lists the two posts separately and suggests that the *apographeus* was in charge of the special contributions paid toward naval defense (συνδοσίαι). As these payments were assessed in relation to the wealth of each region, the official probably worked under the orders of the *praktôr*.<sup>94</sup> Another subordinate officer, the *exisôtês* (ἐξισωτής), was normally attached to the *anagrapheus*.<sup>95</sup> Choniates accuses both Kolymbas and Nomikopoulos of behaving as any typical *exisôtês*, indicating that perhaps the latter held this title.<sup>96</sup> The function of the *exisôtês* was assimilated to that of *anagrapheus/apographeus* in the thirteenth century, when the terms *apographè* and *exisôsis* were both commonly used for land measurement.

The *logariastês*. In the governor's residence at Thebes, the *praitôr* tried to emulate, with reduced resources, the pomp and ceremony of the emperor's entourage. Whenever he traveled he was accompanied by an εἰσκομιδή of followers, among whom were a *logariastês*, *prôtobestiarios*, and *prôtokentarchos*. On occasion this group was so large that Michael Choniates likens it to an army. It was preceded by a smaller group of officials called *hypodochatores*, whose task was to prepare board and lodging for the rest.<sup>97</sup> The duty of providing hospitality was most resented by provincial inhabitants.

Provincial *logariastai* (or *logistai*) were originally minor officials who assisted in the financial work of the *praktôr*. By the twelfth century the post had developed into that of chief adviser to the governor, particularly on financial matters. Governors normally selected their own *logariastai*; for example, the duke of Crete chose Michael Chrysobergès.<sup>98</sup> In Hellas and Peloponnesos one *logariastês*, Basileios Pikridès, was a sophisticated man to whom Michael Choniates could describe the lack of culture in Attica and the region's barbarian dialect. Like others holding this position, Pikridès probably issued documents confirming privileges, authorizing land sales, and ensuring the validity of grants, but nothing specific about his role is revealed by the metropolitan.<sup>99</sup>

The *prôtokentarchos*. This official commanded the provincial troops at the governor's disposition. As the size of military contingents had been greatly

<sup>93</sup> *MM*, VI, 317, 324, 325; *N. Ch.*, 526.

<sup>94</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 308, 310 (*apographè*); cf. the verbal participle, ἀπογραφέντες, II, 107. *Ibid.*, I, 310; II, 105, 107 (*synodosiai*). The term *apographè* is used exclusively for the calculation of the *synodosiai* rate, which had been made at the orders of Iōannēs Doukas; see *infra*, p. 275.

<sup>95</sup> See, for example, Kōnstantinos Hagioeuphēmītēs, *bestarchês* and *exisôtês* of the *anagrapheus* of Thessalonikè in 1104: *Actes de Lavra*, I, no. 56.

<sup>96</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 131.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 309; II, 106–7.

<sup>98</sup> *MM*, IV, 317; VI, 125–27; *Actes de Lavra*, I, nos. 45 and 64; Ahrweiler, "Recherches sur l'administration" (note 5 *supra*), 41, 72; Dölger, *Finanzverwaltung*, 118; R. Guiland, "Études sur l'histoire administrative de l'Empire byzantin. Le logariaste, le megas logariaste," *JÖBG*, 17 (1969), 101–13.

<sup>99</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 87. In ca. 1198 Michael condemned the *praitôr*'s *logariastês* as one of the many officials who descended on Athens: *ibid.*, I, 309.



reduced throughout the Empire by the late twelfth century, and as Hellas and Peloponnesos had to provide chiefly naval services, this military strength was very small. It may have constituted more of a bodyguard than a troop division; certainly there is no indication that the *prôtokentarchos* took part in direct military operations, for example against pirate attacks or against Sgouros' advance into central Greece. On one occasion Choniates complained of the rough treatment one of his ecclesiastics received from this official.<sup>100</sup> Possibly the *prôtokentarchos* was connected with the δρούγγοι, small detachments appointed to guard strategic mountain passes probably on the northern frontier of Hellas which bordered on the insurgent Bulgars. These military bases were often maintained by forced recruitment, for which the governor's chief military adviser might well have been responsible.<sup>101</sup>

The *prôtobestiarios*. This title is normally associated with the emperor's wardrobe; it represents a position of great importance, one usually reserved for trusted friends, relatives, and eunuchs.<sup>102</sup> There is no evidence that provincial governors generally had an equivalent official on their staff. For this reason, it has been suggested that the reading should be corrected to πρωτοβεστιάριτης, a title which becomes common in the Empire of Nicaea and the Despotate of Epiros, mainly in association with financial matters.<sup>103</sup> Unfortunately, there is no indication of the duties of this official in the *praitôr*'s entourage, but the post should be considered in connection with another of Michael's complaints. "In addition to all these, the demand for a new revision of taxes made by the βεστιάριτης and his most terrifying and threatening assistant."<sup>104</sup> This seems to reflect the work of an agent sent by Constantinople to increase taxation from the province by taking new measurements. Normally such revisions would be made on the spot by the *praktôr* and *anagrapheus*. But this was probably a special arrangement which would correspond quite well with the known activities of twelfth-century provincial *bestiaritai*. They were attached to the public section of the treasury (ἔξω βεστιάριον) and held military as well as financial responsibilities. Andronikos Batatzès, for example, was the *bestiaritès* in charge of drawing up a *praktikon* for Lavra in 1181, to clarify the position of its dependent peasantry.<sup>105</sup> During the thirteenth century, this position became more exclusively financial.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 119.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 311; *EM*, I, 49–50; cf. Stadtmüller, "Michael Choniates," 301–3; Ahrweiler, *La Mer* (note 8 *supra*), 278–79. Choniates associates the destruction of the *drouggoi* with the increase in fallow land as part of the same process of decline, suggesting that a certain amount of cultivation was carried out in the mountainous garrisons.

<sup>102</sup> Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions* (note 8 *supra*), I, 216–36.

<sup>103</sup> This correction was proposed by Lampros, *M. Ch.*, II, 516. On the post, see R. Guiland, "Le Protovestiarite," *RSBN*, n.s. 4 (1967), 3–10; A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Ιωάννης Ἀπόκαυκος καὶ Νικήτας Χωνιάτης, in *Τεσσαρακονταετηρίς τοῦ Κ. Σ. Κόντου* (Athens, 1909), 379; *MM*, IV, 232–33; VI, 181–89, 199–201; Ahrweiler, "Smyrne," 161, 164–65, 177–78; but cf. M. Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile. Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204–1261)* (Oxford, 1974), 204–7, 233–35, 253, 256, 268.

<sup>104</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 107.

<sup>105</sup> *Actes de Lavra*, I, no. 65. On the important division of the Treasury into two parts and the work of *bestiaritai*, see Oikonomidès, paper cited in note 8.

The ὑποδοχάτωρ. As Choniates describes the governor's visit to Athens, the hypocrisy angers him even more than the illegality. While the governor and all his party prayed, "the *hypodochatores* came seeking out the wealthiest citizens, collecting food for men and for beasts; taking whole flocks of sheep and fowl, all the produce of the sea, and wine and gold to the value of all our vines."<sup>106</sup> And they demanded προσκυνήτικια, gifts of respect, and insisted that they be paid in gold.<sup>107</sup> This was all nominally legal and due to the governor and officials, except that Athens was specifically protected from such unsolicited visits. In addition, the *hypodochatores* grossly abused the customary duty of providing draught animals for transport by demanding that their owners buy them back.<sup>108</sup> This official's title is derived from ὑποδοχή, a term used in association with the maintenance and lodging of provincial troops. It is frequently mentioned with κάθισμα, διατροφή, and διατριβή, among irregular taxes and *epêreiai* in tax exemption charters.<sup>109</sup> It must have been one of the worst impositions for provincial inhabitants.

Officials involved in the actual collection of taxes made up the largest group in the local power structure. Some were known by the name of the tax they levied, for example, *zeugologountes*; others by more general terms, *dasmologoi*, *phorologountes*, *synergountes*, and so on. To the metropolitan these officials, sent out from the capital every year, appeared to be more numerous than the frogs sent to plague Egypt.<sup>110</sup> He does not, however, give any indication of how many there were, how they were appointed to the province, or how they perpetrated their extortions.

The *kapnologountes* among these officials were responsible for the *kapnologion*, thirteenth-century name for the *καπνικόν* (hearth tax). In the same way, *zeugologountes* must have collected the *zeugologion*, a tax on haulage animals. As these two basic charges were usually calculated and collected together, the officials probably went round together—they may have simply adopted the name of the particular tax.<sup>111</sup> It is not clear what proportion of the population of Hellas and Peloponnesos was liable for these taxes. A law of 1144 exempted clergy from the *zeugologion*, and many ecclesiastical institutions did not pay the *kapnikon*/*kapnologion*.<sup>112</sup> But most peasant families probably had to pay;

<sup>106</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 309; cf. II, 106.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, loc. cit. *Proskynêtikia* were often denoted by other terms, such as *kephalatikion*, *kaniskion*, and *misthos*; see *MM*, V, 142–43; VI, 47, 121–22. Michael also uses *antidosis* in the same sense: *M. Ch.*, II, 100. All were gifts to which provincial officials were entitled and often consisted of provisions; for example, see the contents of a *kaniskion* (literally, basket) due to a judge: one loaf, one fowl, one *modion* of wheat, and half a measure of wine: *Actes d'Esphigmenou*, no. 5.

<sup>108</sup> On this *aggareia tôn hypozugiôn*, see *M. Ch.*, I, 309; II, 107.

<sup>109</sup> *MM*, V, 137, 144; VI, 47. Cf. Stadtmüller, "Michael Choniates," 293–94.

<sup>110</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 105; cf. I, 307; II, 83, 106; *Life of Hosios Meletios*, ed. V. Vasil'evskij, *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, 17 (1886), 49. In the singular, these terms might refer to an individual tax collector of some importance; see *N. Ch.*, 342 (*dasmologos*), 700 (*phorologos*); Hélène Ahrweiler, "L'Administration militaire de la Crète byzantine," *Byzantion*, 31 (1961), 227.

<sup>111</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 106; *MM*, V, 83; VI, 7; PG, 126, cols. 515D, 536A; Dölger, *Finanzverwaltung*, 51, 53; Ahrweiler, "Smyrne," 125–27. On the exemption accorded to certain monasteries, see Zepos, *Jus*, III, 447, 453; *Actes de Lavra*, I, nos. 38, 44.

<sup>112</sup> Zepos, *Jus*, III, 432.

they were rated according to the number and kind of animals they possessed.<sup>113</sup>

A different set of officials took charge of naval taxes, which consisted of a regular basic tax (βάρος πλοῦς or πλώϊμον), and contributions (συνδοσίαι) destined for ship building, maintenance, equipment, arms, and procurement of local naval forces. Both taxes were established by official surveys, such as the *apographè* made on the order of Iōannēs Doukas, *logothetēs tou dromou*.<sup>114</sup> But they could also be levied at any time as an irregular tax for specific campaigns, *epēreia tou stolou*, a provision which was greatly abused by maritime tax collectors, πλωϊμολόγοι, κατεργοκτίσται, and ναυτολόγοι. Choniates records that in one year three separate naval contributions were demanded: one for ship building (κτίσις κατέργων); one on the occasion of Steiriōnēs' visit to Athens; and a third levied in the name of Sgouros and the *praitōr*.<sup>115</sup> The official survey also listed the number of sailors to be provided by Athens. If personal service was not required, another money payment would certainly have been added. According to the metropolitan, maritime taxes were especially heavy in the *horion* of Athens, in comparison with Thebes and Euripos, and the tax agents often demanded more than the rate settled for contributions.<sup>116</sup>

In conclusion, the *praktōr* was the most powerful local official after the governor, who often preferred to stay in the capital rather than take up a provincial appointment. Once established in the official residence, the *praitōr* had almost unrestricted authority and was free of supervision; so, in turn, were the *antipraitōr*, *praktōr*, or *anagrapheus* when acting as governor. Local inhabitants could resist this authority by armed force, and there is evidence of such resistance; otherwise their only means of redress was to appeal to Constantinople—a common practice but not very effective. The decline of central administrative control in the provinces was left unchecked and the development of independent forces thereby encouraged. These might be organized by breakaway officials from the capital, for example Michael Komnēnos Doukas, *phorologos* of Mylassa and Melanoudion, Isaac Komnēnos in Cyprus, and the Gabras family in Trebizond, or by local landowners such as Sgouros, Chamaretos, and Chalkoutzēs.<sup>117</sup> The latter owned property in the provinces where they were sometimes identified as θεματικοὶ καὶ κτηματικοὶ ἄρχοντες. While they aspired to imperial honors, they were not entirely at home in Constantinopolitan society. In contrast to the all-powerful *dynatoi*, these provincial families represented lesser landowners, who sent many of their numbers

<sup>113</sup> The method of assessment is illustrated in the *praktikon* of Andronikos Doukas: *MM*, VI, 4–15.

<sup>114</sup> On Iōannēs Doukas, see Guillard, "Les logothètes" (note 79 *supra*), 44–45, 63–65; and, most recently, A. P. Kazhdan, *Le parole e le idee*, 9 (1969), 242–47, and P. Karlin-Hayter, *Byzantion*, 42 (1972), 259–65, 300–1. Contributions for a very wide range of ancillary services might be demanded; see, for example, Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 212.

<sup>115</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 307–8; II, 105, 106–7.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 308, 310; cf. H. Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Études d'histoire maritime de Byzance* (Paris, 1966), 41–43.

<sup>117</sup> *N. Ch.*, 700–1, 376–79, 443–44, 483–84, 547; *M. Ch.*, II, 277–78, 279–80; cf. Hoffmann, *op. cit.*

into the local administration. Of the agents named by Michael Choniates, the *praktôr* Tessarakontapèchys can be identified with one of these. Others such as Rendakios, Pothos, Pardos, and Leobachos had a strong influence over regional developments.<sup>118</sup> It was possibly from the ranks of these families that the *καστρηνοί* (city dwellers) and the *βοιωτάρχουντες* (Boiotian leaders) were drawn—anonymous groups who were powerful enough to resist the provincial governor and the metropolitan.<sup>119</sup> They were typical of local landowners all over the Empire whose generally independent attitude brought them into conflict with the capital. Toward the end of the twelfth century they did not hesitate, when they saw an opportunity, to improve their personal fortunes at the expense of the central administration.

### MILITARY ADMINISTRATION

The *megas doux* had supreme authority in Hellas and Peloponnesos, but the practical effects of his control were very slight. By the end of the twelfth century, instead of manifesting itself as a living embodiment, this most powerful post appears only to have cast a distant shadow over provincial life. High titles from the capital stood in inverse proportion to actual influence over developments in the provinces.

The origin of the post of *megas doux* lay in two revolts of 1092, when the commanders of important naval bases on Cyprus and Crete rebelled. Their alleged purpose was to protest against excessive taxation, but they may also have taken advantage of the Emir of Smyrna's activity in the Aegean; they may even have supported him.<sup>120</sup> As Alexios I realized the threat posed to his already precarious military situation, he sent a large sea and land force against the Emir. His brother-in-law, Iôannès Doukas, was recalled from Dyrrachion to command this expedition as *megas doux tou stolou*.<sup>121</sup> In the course of the campaign, several Aegean islands were retaken and from this base Doukas was able to put down the mutiny on Crete. Leaving a garrison there, he sailed on to Cyprus where forces were landed and the rebel leader captured.<sup>122</sup>

In his concern to prevent a repetition of these revolts, Alexios seems to have undertaken a systematic overhaul of naval organization. The new post of *megas doux* assumed total responsibility for levying troops, ships' crews, and equipment in all naval areas, and for maritime defense throughout the Em-

<sup>118</sup> The Rendakios and Tessarakontapèchys families of central Greece had been related to imperial dynasties in the ninth and tenth centuries, but failed to maintain good relations with the Komnènoi; see Cedrenus, *Synopsis historiarum* (note 86 *supra*), II, 297–98, 548; Costantino Porfirogenito, *De thematibus*, ed. A. Pertusi (Vatican City, 1952), 91; Antonin, *op. cit.* (note 26 *supra*), 23–25, no. 17; Svoronos, "Le cadastre de Thèbes" (note 3 *supra*), 11, 13–14, 18; Bees, "Zur Sigillographie" (note 77 *supra*), 199–200.

<sup>119</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 311, 315–16; D. Jacoby, "Les archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque," *TM*, 2 (1967), 427–28.

<sup>120</sup> Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 184–86.

<sup>121</sup> Anna Comnène, *Alexiade*, ed. and trans. B. Leib (Paris, 1937–45), III, 158–62.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 162–64; *Life of Meletios*, 27.

pire.<sup>123</sup> To the strategically sensitive bases, the Adriatic coast, Cyprus, and Crete, the *megas doux* appointed his own trusted men, for example, Iōannēs Helladikos, κατεπάνω Κρήτης καὶ οἰκείος ἀνδρῶπος of the supreme commander, Philokalēs.<sup>124</sup> Often relatives of the emperor held these crucial positions, but this custom reflects the development of "familial" government favored by the Komnēnoi.<sup>125</sup> In addition to reliable military officials, naval regions also had civilian administrators appointed from the capital; this civilian government was, however, thoroughly subordinated to naval priorities. The system can be illustrated by the situation of ca. 1094: Iōannēs Doukas left Eumathios Philokalēs on Cyprus as *stratopedarchēs*, and he appointed Michael Karantēnos *doux* of Crete. Simultaneously, one Kalliparios was sent to Cyprus as *kritēs kai exisôtēs*, a civil and judicial figure who doubtless had his counterpart on Crete.<sup>126</sup> The *megas doux* also controlled several subaltern naval commanders (θαλασσοκράτορες and δούκες), such as Kōnstantinos Dalassēnos, who led a successful mission to remove the Emir of Smyrna. Lesser officials ran the administration of the *megas doux* from the capital.<sup>127</sup>

In Hellas and Peloponnesos (and this was important to east/west communication but not to the most sensitive coastlands of the Empire) the *megas doux* did not appoint a similar naval commander on a regular basis. Although it would have been logical to revise the whole structure uniformly, there is no direct evidence that governors of the province were normally appointed in the same way as other "men" of the *megas doux*. Rather, they corresponded to civilian governors of the eleventh century, supervising provincial law courts, tax offices, and so on (see p. 267f. *supra*). Given the relative unimportance of the area, both in naval matters and in administrative status, this anomaly is not surprising.<sup>128</sup> It was very probably generated by financial considerations: if Constantinople had to appoint a civilian governor anyway, then there was no need to pay another man. Unlike the key islands or the vital Adriatic coast, Hellas and Peloponnesos rarely attracted officials who were making a professional career in the administration.<sup>129</sup>

So the weakness of Greek naval forces in relation to other maritime areas is understandable. But the degree of disorganization was only revealed in the

<sup>123</sup> On the general reorganization, see Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 197–99; Oikonomidēs, paper cited in note 8. The regions which thus became specifically naval had held a similar status in previous military administration; see N. Oikonomidēs, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1972), 265.

<sup>124</sup> *MM*, VI, 96–97.

<sup>125</sup> Hohlweg, *Verwaltungsgeschichte* (note 8 *supra*), 15–34; J. Verpeaux, "Les oikeioi. Notes d'histoire institutionnelle et sociale," *REB*, 23 (1965), 89–99.

<sup>126</sup> *Alexiade*, III, 169; H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes de l'Asie Mineure*, fasc. 1 (Paris, 1922), no. 226<sup>8</sup>; cf. L. Robert, "Sur Didymes à l'époque byzantine," *Hellenica*, 11–12 (1960), 495–96; and on the date, see Ahrweiler, "L'Administration militaire de la Crète byzantine" (note 110 *supra*), 225–26.

<sup>127</sup> *Alexiade*, III, 160, 164; Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 209–10; Hohlweg, *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, 146–57, correctly stresses that *megaloi doukes* were often responsible for military and land operations as well as naval. Often other *thalassokratores* and *doukes tou stolou* commanded sections of a force, while the *megas doux* remained in overall control.

<sup>128</sup> Ahrweiler, *ibid.*, 208–9, 275–77; Oikonomidēs, paper cited in note 8.

<sup>129</sup> On these promotion channels, see especially V. Laurent, "Andronikos Synadenos, ou la carrière d'un haut fonctionnaire byzantin au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *REB*, 20 (1962), 210–14.

Norman raid of 1147. Monemvasia proved the sole port capable of self-defense—which it may well have owed to its extraordinary site—and the Normans were allowed to advance inland to Thebes and to sack Corinth, despite the existence of a military garrison at Acrocorinth.<sup>130</sup> Thus, in the first half of the twelfth century, provincial forces could be utterly ineffective. The central administration responded with the appointment of Stephanos Kontostephanos as *megas doux*, sent to relieve Corfu in 1148/49.<sup>131</sup> But there is no indication that he or his successors were concerned about improving the situation in central Greece.

Clear evidence is lacking on the composition of naval and military forces assigned to the province after Alexios' reforms. The organization had its origins in the thematic military formations of the Middle Byzantine period. The fleets of Hellas and Peloponnesos were composed of sailors holding a *pleustikè strateia*; they were inscribed on naval lists corresponding to military ones as *apotetagmenoi plōimoi*.<sup>132</sup> During the eleventh century, reorganization of fighting forces and commutation of personal service to a money payment meant an increase in overall taxation. But in the *horion* of Athens, in addition to heavy naval taxes, sailors still had to be provided. As the naval bureau's abuses were well known, the monastery of Lavra was careful to stipulate that its sailors should not be pressed into public service, even if the Empire might be in the greatest danger.<sup>133</sup>

Following the reforms of Alexios I, the system can be reconstructed as follows: a local naval squadron was attached to each significant port in the maritime provinces. It patrolled coastal waters and defended the area. These ports were the bases for military and naval operations in the surrounding region, which became subdivisions of the province known as *κατεπανίκια* or *ὄρια*. They were administered by officials, *κατεπάνω*, *δούξ*, or *ἄρχων*, appointed from Constantinople with wide-ranging powers over all maritime activity—transport, commercial events involving foreigners, and so on. They may also have supervised the collection of naval taxes.<sup>134</sup> There is no evidence that a whole flotilla of special boats and crews was constantly maintained. Probably local captains and sailors were enlisted for specific services when necessary, but it is difficult to tell how such units operated in practice.<sup>135</sup>

Beginning with the reign of John II (1118–43), money raised from all regular naval taxation was diverted to the capital rather than remaining in the provinces. Local defense as well as the entire naval apparatus declined. This development may well indicate a turning point, for the *archontes* seem to dis-

<sup>130</sup> Cinnamos, *Epitome* (note 74 *supra*), 96–101; *N. Ch.*, 96–102; cf. the analysis in Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 241–43; and see *infra*, p. 281.

<sup>131</sup> Cinnamos, *Epitome*, 97; *N. Ch.*, 103–5.

<sup>132</sup> Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, appendix 1, 401; Antoniadis-Bibicou, *op. cit.* (note 116 *supra*), 39–46, appendix 2, 138–40, on the recruitment of sailors, *ἐκβολὴ πλωτῶν*.

<sup>133</sup> *Kekaumenos* (note 7 *supra*), 294–96, on the *pleustikoi archontes*; *Actes de Lavra*, I, no. 55.

<sup>134</sup> This activity is illustrated by the *archôn* of Athens, *ἀρχηγός*, known from the *Life of Meletios*, 32–33, i.e., before 1105; cf. Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 210, 223–25, 277–78.

<sup>135</sup> Although there is evidence of provincial ships participating in Byzantine naval campaigns during the twelfth century, the efficient upkeep of all local forces can not be assumed.

appear in the late twelfth century. The administrative division of the province into *horia* survived, but its purpose and main role were obliterated.<sup>136</sup> Officials such as *plôimologoi* and *nautologoi* continued nonetheless to collect taxes. In times of crisis, imagined or real, men were conscripted into active service. Toward the end of the twelfth century, a special fleet was to be equipped for the purpose of destroying Gafforio, a Genoese pirate, whose activities were hampering Byzantine shipping in the Aegean. On the orders of the *megas doux*, Steiriônès was sent to central Greece to levy additional taxation to cover expenses. Not only did the local population furnish supplies and money to outfit the boats, but men were impressed into service as oarsmen and sailors. And although Gafforio was eventually defeated, Michael complained that Attica still suffered pirate raids.<sup>137</sup>

Nor was service confined to the navy. Small inland garrisons, often connected by mountain passes, required "volunteers." The process of forced recruitment of men to maintain these garrisons—an echo of the complaints about naval duty demanded of some Athenians—is recorded by Euthymios of Neopatras. As soon as a farmer had been sent off to join the garrison, his lands were expropriated by the official responsible for his departure.<sup>138</sup> Thus, governors and junior staff could arrange their own personal gain at the expense of those unfortunates. Illegal occupation of peasant holdings was apparently common in the lawless atmosphere of twelfth-century Greece. Choniates accused the *kastrènoi*, more powerful Athenians with influence in local government circles, of driving farmers off the land, only to occupy but not to cultivate it. As a result, impoverished peasants were "blown over the countryside like leaves in the wind," and everyone suffered the waste of fallow lands.<sup>139</sup>

These developments produced a paradoxical situation: the population paid heavy maritime taxes which should have been used to maintain the squadron based in each *horion*, but in practice there was a total lack of naval defense. After the departure of the *archôn*, local seamen who owned boats, *nauklèroi*, probably reverted to transporting goods and persons from port to port; fishermen went back to their fishing; and pirates continued to harass coastal settlements without opposition. A Monemvasiot boat sailed between its home port and Athens, while pirate activity from Makri (Makronisi), a small island off Attica, persisted about as regularly.<sup>140</sup>

This process of decline in regional forces was symptomatic of a much broader and disruptive development in twelfth-century Byzantine administration.

<sup>136</sup> The existence of these *horia* is confirmed in several treaties and in the *Partitio regni Graeci* (*Partitio Romaniae*) drawn up by the Crusaders in 1204; see *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, eds. G. L. F. Tafel and G. M. Thomas (Vienna, 1856–57), I, 264–67, 469–92; but there is no evidence of appropriate *archontes*. There were five *horia* in Greece at the end of the twelfth century: Larissa, Thebes-Euripos, Athens, Patras-Methone, and Corinth-Argos-Nauplion; and several *episkepseis*, such as Megara. In other parts of the Empire, these units were known as *katepanikia* and *chartoularata*.

<sup>137</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 310; II, 107, 122, 125, 129. Cf. Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 277, 289–91.

<sup>138</sup> *EM*, I, 73–74. Bardas, the *architelônès*, was in charge of this operation.

<sup>139</sup> *M. Ch.*, I, 311; II, 99, 124–25.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 99, 129, 137, 238.

Naval policy during the reign of Alexios I was directed specifically toward the control over trade routes between Constantinople and the Mediterranean, and the destruction of hostile forces in Byzantine waters. In this, the Byzantines were assisted by the Venetians who agreed to provide naval support for the Empire in exchange for trading concessions.<sup>141</sup> Those holding the post of *megas doux* took an active part in the planning and execution of naval operations. They commanded Venetian flotillas and drew upon local forces where possible, but the imperial fleet based in Constantinople was the chief fighting force. On their orders, subordinate naval commanders led expeditions probably with smaller squadrons outfitted in the capital.<sup>142</sup>

John II, however, abandoned his father's policy and tried to repudiate the Venetian treaty. Venice retaliated with an effective punitive naval raid in which several Aegean islands were devastated. In 1126, therefore, the treaty was renegotiated and the old arrangements rather shakily restored.<sup>143</sup> The Italian Republic extended its trading position within the Empire and pledged naval protection. John II seems to have considered this promise adequate to cover all local maritime defense, for he approved a proposal by Iōannēs Poutzès, a financial minister, to withdraw regular naval taxation from the provinces to the capital.<sup>144</sup> From this time on, *archontes* in the *horia* and regional fleets gradually disappeared. Simultaneously, the post of *megas doux* and the whole naval bureau at Constantinople were reduced to largely financial concerns. Some provincial naval activity continued, especially in the waters of Crete and the Adriatic, and ports such as Monemvasia survived as bases. But after the reign of Manuel I (1143–80), *megaloι doukes* commanded few and often unreliable foreign forces; indigenous regional fleets were no longer maintained; and naval operations took place with very low morale. Dependence upon Venice, which failed conspicuously to check the success of Norman and other Italian ships in Byzantine waters, and neglect of native shipping destroyed the Byzantine navy.<sup>145</sup>

In this situation, top military and naval officials were not much concerned with the strategic defense of the Empire; they accepted their posts as sinecures, honorary titles to be bought.<sup>146</sup> While the *megas doux* could have taken an interest in the efficiency of local government and regional forces, his main activity was to ensure the collection of taxes destined officially for naval upkeep. This primary economic concern developed through the over-fiscalization of the central administration—following Poutzès' example, all bureaus sought

<sup>141</sup> Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1081; Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 180–82.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 186–87, 192–97.

<sup>143</sup> Ahrweiler, *La Mer*, 229–33; Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1304.

<sup>144</sup> *N. Ch.*, 54–56; *Synopsis Chronikē*, ed. K. Sathas, Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, 7 (1897), 220–22; Lemerle, "Recherches sur le régime agraire" (note 69 *supra*), 275. Poutzès has been blamed for causing the decline of the Byzantine navy, but the worst effects of his measure were felt in the provinces where naval *archontes* were left without funds for the upkeep of local forces.

<sup>145</sup> The imperial fleet of Constantinople sustained some fighting capacity, but it was a weak successor to the tenth-century fleet. On this decline and on the consequences of dependence on Venice, see Judith Herrin, "The Collapse of the Byzantine Empire in the Twelfth Century: a Study of a Medieval Economy," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 12 (1970), 190–93, 199, 202.

<sup>146</sup> See, for example, Stryphnos' sale of naval materials: *N. Ch.*, 716.



to increase their revenues from the provinces. Such actions did nothing to restore any semblance of vigor to the ailing Byzantine military machine.

The official structure of government is reflected, nonetheless, in the titles adopted by *megaloi doukes* during the twelfth century. Eumathios Philokalès, who governed Cyprus for many years before he was promoted to *megas doux*, took the title of *praitôr* between 1112 and 1118. Alexios Komnènos Bryennios appears to have spent some time in the area and was known as *anthypatos*, though it is doubtful whether his role was as great as Michael Choniates claimed.<sup>147</sup> Lastly, *megas doux* Stryphnos paid a visit to Athens also as *anthypatos*. A measure of his attitude toward the province can be gauged from Michael's letter promising him the customary gifts, *antidoseis*.<sup>148</sup> In addition, several officers of the *megas doux* were associated with Hellas and Peloponnesos: Leôn Nikeritès, a brilliant commander, held the post of governor (*stratègos*) in Peloponnesos for a time, and also the title of *anthypatos*. In the 1160's Alexios Kontostephanos was appointed to the province as the subordinate of his brother Andronikos, *megas doux*.<sup>149</sup> Garrison commanders should also be considered together with these junior officials, although the method of their appointment is not clear. At the time of the Norman raid, Nikèphoros Chalouphès was in charge of the strong defenses of Acrocorinth. Despite his failure to protect the population of Corinth, he appears to have had a long career under Manuel.<sup>150</sup> Another force stationed in Peloponnesos marched to the relief of Thessalonikè in 1185 under the command of Iôannès Maurozômès, a member of an important local family.<sup>151</sup> Finally, Bardas, an ἀρχιτελώνης, was responsible for ordering the enforced military service of poor peasants.<sup>152</sup> As such, he was probably one of the governor's men who worked together with the *prôtokentarchos*.

To sum up the military situation in Hellas and Peloponnesos, it is clear that the new system established by Alexios I was never as firmly implanted in Greece as in other regions. It was seriously undermined by the policies of John II, who removed naval *archontes* from the provinces by cutting off their resources. While small military detachments continued to guard important castles, usually at strategic inland sites, the forces making up local fleets gradually disintegrated. Naval authority remained officially the most powerful in the province, but the *megas doux* had very little direct influence or concern. In the final years of Byzantine rule in central Greece, *megas doux* Stryphnos provides an archetypal example of the degeneration of the plans of Alexios I.

<sup>147</sup> See chart (following p. 284), notes 6 and 10.

<sup>148</sup> *M. Ch.*, II, 98–100. It appears that Stryphnos had demanded these payments even though he was not in the province nor doing anything for it.

<sup>149</sup> See chart (following p. 284), notes 17 and 24.

<sup>150</sup> *N. Ch.*, 101; Cinnamos, *Epitome* (note 74 *supra*), 248–49, 262–63, 265; Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1464. During Manuel's campaign in Dalmatia, Nikèphoros Chalouphès was left in command of recently conquered territory in a sensitive area, but he was taken prisoner and had to be ransomed from the Hungarians.

<sup>151</sup> Eustathios of Thessalonikè, *La Espugnazione di Tessalonica*, ed. S. Kyriakidès (Palermo, 1961), 88. Among other members of the family, Theodôros Maurozômès, a naval commander under Andronikos Kontostephanos, is mentioned in connection with the local flotilla of Euboia: *N. Ch.*, 208, cf. 234, 827–28, 842.

<sup>152</sup> *EM*, I, 49–50.

## CONCLUSION

Eleventh- and twelfth-century reforms in Byzantine administration shattered the relationship between province and capital. The centralization of military control and fiscalization of services and dues, previously performed in person or paid in kind, produced great hostility to Constantinople in the themes. Taxation drained the provinces of resources without providing any of the services (among others, local defense, upkeep of roads, bridges, and government buildings) which were basic to the most minimal administration. These developments changed the attitude of provincial inhabitants. Constantinople was no longer seen as the source of concerned paternalistic government; the benefits of living under Byzantine rule as "Rômaioi," once an index of civilization, had gone. The capital had developed a parasitic relationship with the provinces.

As economic affairs worsened at the center, the local government of Hellas and Peloponnesos developed a competitive aspect—all sectors of the administration attempted to collect their own taxation from the same regional population. Interaction between administrators became hostile when they tried to capture the limited resources available for themselves. The *mezas doux* was usually present only through his officials, who persisted in levying taxes destined supposedly for local defense. On rare occasions he might make a personal visit to receive the customary gifts due to the supreme authority in the province, i.e., his concern was basically mercenary. Similarly, the civilian governor who was more often on the spot aimed to get his full share of supplies and services. Given the fact that the position did not carry a fixed salary, it is hardly surprising that governors often spent only a short period in the province, taking advantage of whatever benefits could be obtained.

In contrast to military and civilian authorities, ecclesiastical administrators had less incentive to impose financial hardships on their parishioners. They naturally guarded their rights to the *kanonikon* and tried to enforce the rents due on ecclesiastical properties in the region. Such ecclesiastical taxation, however, constituted a tiny fraction of the total sum expected from local inhabitants.

This decline in provincial administration, which was common to all parts of the Empire, illustrates various differences between the three sectors. On the recruitment and suitability of administrators, it is clear that metropolitans were, on the whole, cultivated men, educated and trained at the capital in the highest clerical circles. Many were not prepared for provincial life but most accepted its privations as part of the job. To a certain extent their training motivated them to the task of working and preaching in a largely illiterate community, and they recognized the value of such work. Governors, of course, were also experienced officials, and those from the central administration were often well qualified to run provincial government. Many, however, left the capital most unwillingly, while some, Iôannès Hagiotheodôritès for example, were simply exiled. This was not particular to the period. For centuries all

officials accustomed to life in Constantinople usually found provincial duty tedious, an experience to be avoided if possible. But in the context of twelfth-century bureaucracy, a rather different and contradictory situation arose. On the one hand, officials were even more reluctant to leave the capital. On the other, they went to the provinces to recoup and to increase funds used to purchase the position. Provincial administration was thus reduced to a form of investment expected to yield as much as or more than other forms. Such corruption was hardly an example of impartial and just administration for junior agents who were often left in control. As for *megaloï doukes*, their qualifications for the post came to depend more on a close relationship with the emperor than on any particular skill. Not all of them were as bad commanders as Stryphnos, but very few had any concept of the potential of provincial fleets or tried to do anything about them.

When it came to maintaining some continuity of provincial government, ecclesiastics were again in a better position than other officials. Twelfth-century metropolitans of Athens assisted at church synods at Constantinople, but they normally resided on the Acropolis and were concerned for their see. Michael Choniates appears to have left the area only once in a twenty-year period. Another factor contributing to the continuity of metropolitan administration lay in the employment of local deacons and monks on the staff usually for long periods. The civilian governors, by contrast, changed all too rapidly and were often absent, to judge by the number of stand-in officials recorded. The coming and going of such figures resulted in more disruption than traditional administration. Subordinate agents working in the provincial government did preserve a minimal continuity, but as this would have existed at the lowest level only, it cannot have constituted a strong influence. While officials of the *meγas doux* made very regular appearances in the province, at least once a year according to Choniates, their activity was certainly not a positive factor in naval administration. Frequent changes in the post of *meγas doux* and its pre-occupations with affairs beyond the theme of Hellas and Peloponnesos almost ruled out continuity in this sector.

As imperial control in central Greece became progressively weaker, local landowners began to take matters into their own hands, albeit in a small way. Numerous individuals and groups, often anonymous, resisted all forms of established authority and tried to create their own independent territories. The activity of Leôn Sgouros provides an outstanding example, and one of the most developed, in that he recruited an army and sought to gain entry into court circles, both by the assumption of titles and through marriage. Lesser *archontes* in Boiotia united to prevent the governor from visiting Euripos, doubtless on another of his raiding expeditions. Similar actions by Manuel Kammytzès further north in Thessaly, and by Leôn Chamaretos in the region of Sparta, indicate that this was a general and widespread reaction to the decline in provincial government. Independence from the arbitrary demands of official administrators was the common aim. In Hellas and Peloponnesos no distinction was made between representatives of the *meγas doux* and other tax

collectors, as by now all these officials had the same concern. There was absolutely no respect for the highest authority in the province.

In this situation the Church gained a new position in provincial society. When the civilian administration proved incapable, it was the metropolitans who had to deal with both foreign and indigenous threats. Michael Choniates' organized resistance to Leôn Sgouros was merely one instance of this phenomenon which can be traced throughout the Empire. Although the Church had no physical strength in the form of armed soldiers, several successful defenses against military attacks were mounted by churchmen with the help of local inhabitants. Even when forced into exile the Orthodox Church could run a shadow administration, but it was naturally incapable of replacing imperial government. Its strength grew from the fact that the Church represented all that was most advanced in the culture of Constantinople—education, use of written documents, and enduring Christian ideals which benefited the local population. The performance of services necessary to Orthodox life, baptism, marriage, burial, and celebration of the liturgy, gave metropolitans in the disorders of the late twelfth century effective authority in provincial society. Despite its military and juridical impotence, for the inhabitants of outlying regions the Church stood for the stability of imperial government which was so rapidly disintegrating.

This breakdown of administrative structures in Hellas and Peloponnesos was by no means exceptional; on the contrary, it was typical of a general decline. At the end of the twelfth century Byzantine provincial government was in reality a series of agents competing for the wealth of the theme. Of the three sectors, the ecclesiastical, through its charitable and educational work, played a more beneficial role than the civilian or military. And in the face of separatist movements and local revolts, it displayed more strength and courage than either of them.

<sup>1</sup> The first *megas doux* is known only through his official, *pronoētēs tōn klēmātōn tou megalou doukos*, active in the region of Hierissos; see *Actes de Xéropotamou*, ed. J. Bompaire, Archives de l'Athos, III (Paris, 1963), no. 7. This document is dated ca. 1085, i.e., at least five years before the title of *megas doux* is recorded. As a close relative of the emperor, Iōannēs Doukas might have been given properties near Mt. Athos. In 1085 he was probably commander of the naval post at Dyrrachion, but he did not become *megas doux* until ca. 1090; see *infra*. In the first decade of Alexios' reign there were many *doukes tou stolou*; see R. Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* (Berlin/Amsterdam, 1967), I, 542–43.

<sup>2</sup> On Iōannēs Doukas, son of Andronikos, *prōtobestiarios*, and brother-in-law of Alexios I, see D. Polemis, *The Doukai* (London, 1968), 66–70; A. Hohlweg, *Beiträge zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des oströmischen Reiches unter den Komnenen*, Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, 1 (Munich, 1965), 17, 23, 142–47; cf. P. Gautier, "L'obituaire du typikon du Pantocrator," *REB*, 27 (1969), 254.

<sup>3</sup> Landulf was one of the most successful non-Greek commanders of the Byzantine navy; see Anna Comène, *Alexiade*, ed. and trans. B. Leib (Paris, 1937–45), III, 42–47, 81–82; F. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis I<sup>er</sup> Comnène (1081–1118)* (Paris, 1900), 215, 235, 243.

<sup>4</sup> On Isaac Kontostephanos, the first of this celebrated family to hold the position, see H. Grégoire, "Notes épigraphiques XII," *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*, 52 (1909), pt. 3, 152–61; Hohlweg, *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, 147–48; and notes 8, 11, and 24 *infra*.

<sup>5</sup> Marianos Maurokatakālōn also came from a distinguished military family. The son of another naval commander, Nikolaos, he married the sister of Nikèphoros Bryennios. He appears to have been appointed *megas doux* when Alexios I was angered by Isaac Kontostephanos, who was effectively demoted; see Anna Comnène, *Alexiade*, II, 216–20; III, 111–15.

<sup>6</sup> Eumathios Philokalēs gained prominence as *stratopedarchēs* of Cyprus after the revolt of 1092; he had previously been *stratēgos* of Crete; see S. Marinatos, Εὐμάθιος ὁ Φιλοκάλης, τελευταῖος στρατηγὸς τοῦ Ἰεματός τῆς Κρήτης, in 'Επ. 'Ετ. Βυλ. Σπ., 7 (1930), 388–93. He was twice *doux* of Cyprus before 1118, when he held the highest naval post as *megas doux*. In this capacity he took over the government of Hellas and Peloponnesos as *praitōr*, a title recorded on his seal; see A. Bon, *Le Péloponnèse byzantin jusqu'en 1204* (Paris, 1952), 197–99, no. 48. On his career and his association with the monastery of St. Chrysostom in northern Cyprus, see C. Mango and E. J. W. Hawkins, "Report on Field Work in Istanbul and Cyprus, 1962–1963," *DOP*, 18 (1964), 335–39; and on his family, see A. P. Každan, *Social'nyj sostav gospodstvujuščego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow, 1974), 161–62.

<sup>7</sup> Nikèphoros Batatzēs is known as *megas doux* only from his seal; see B. A. Pančenko, "Katalog' molivdovolov'," *IRAİK*, 9 (1904), 376, no. 241, which also records his position as *praitōr* of the Aegean, another maritime region which fell under the control of the *megas doux*. On his family, see K. Amantos, 'Η οικογένεια Βατάτζη, in 'Επ. 'Ετ. Βυλ. Σπ., 21 (1951), 174–78.

<sup>8</sup> Stephanos Kontostephanos, brother-in-law of Manuel I, died at the siege of Corfù in 1149 after only two years as *megas doux*; see page 278 *supra*.

<sup>9</sup> Alexios Katakourianos is another official known only by his seal; see G. Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris, 1884), 670.

<sup>10</sup> Alexios Komnēnos Bryennios, the son of Anna and Nikèphoros Bryennios, made a successful career under Manuel I, rising to become *megas doux* in ca. 1156; see Joannes Cinnamos, *Epitome*, Bonn ed. (1836), 165–68; Hélène Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la Mer* (Paris, 1966), 254. Michael Choniates records that as *megas doux* Alexios, taking the title *anthypatos*, governed Hellas and Peloponnesos, and claims that he was an exceptionally good governor; see Μιχαήλ 'Ακομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ σωζόμενα, ed. S. Lampros (Athens, 1878–80), I, 336, 338.

<sup>11</sup> Andronikos Kontostephanos, son of Stephanos, held the post of *megas doux* for a long time, from ca. 1169 until after the accession of Andronikos I in 1182; see Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la Mer*, 259, 265–66, 281. On his decisive role in 1182, see C. M. Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 38–46.

<sup>12</sup> Under Manuel I there are at least two characters called Iōannēs Komnēnos, and sorting out their careers is extremely difficult. From a poem of Theodōros Prodromos it appears that Iōannēs, *prōtosebastos* and *megas doux*, son of a *sebastokrator*, restored the monastery of Christ "tou Euergetou," and retired there taking the monastic name of Ignatios; see Νέος Έλλ., 8, pt. 1 (1911), 19–20; R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, I, 3: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 2nd ed., 1969), 508f. This cannot be the same person who served in Cyprus and was killed at the battle of Myriocephalon, but there are many complications in the identification; see V. Laurent, "Andronikos Synadenos, ou la carrière d'un haut fonctionnaire byzantin au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *REB*, 20 (1962), 212f.

<sup>13</sup> Theodōra Komnēnē must have taken great pride in her father, Isaac, commander of the navy, to judge from her seal; see Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 644–45. On the problem of his identity, see Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions*, I, 547.

14 On Stryphnos, brother-in-law of Alexios III, see *supra*, pp. 281, 283.

15 Kōnstantinos Choirosphaktēs held several important positions at court before he was appointed *praitōr* to Hellas and Peloponnesos; he served as ambassador for Nikēphoros III, and became the “*oikeios anthrōpos*” of Alexios I; see Anna Comnène, *Alexiade*, I, 133–34; Nicephorus Bryennius, *Commentarii*, Bonn ed. (1836), 130. His title of *praitōr* is recorded in the *Life* of Hosios Meletios, ed. V. Vasil’evskij, *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, 17 (1886), 34; and on his seal, see Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 188, 636. The family had connections with Greece; see Bon, *Le Péloponnèse*, 195–96, no. 44; N. Bees, “Zur Sigillographie der byzantinischen Themen Hellas und Peloponnesos,” *VizVrem*, 21 (1914), 224–26; Každan, *op. cit.*, 91, 135, 203.

16 Epiphánios Kamatēros came from another family with property in central Greece; see J. Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikēs. Lettres et Discours* (Paris, 1970), 48–49; Každan, *op. cit.*, 89. He governed Hellas and Peloponnesos with the title of *anthypatos* (*Life of Meletios*, 53); and two seals which might belong to him carry the titles *proedros* and *eparchos*, and *spatharokandidatos kai tourmarchēs*; see Bon, *Le Péloponnèse*, 196–97, no. 47.

17 Leōn Nikeritēs is known from the *Life of Meletios* as *stratēgos* of Peloponnesos and probably governed both themes; he also served as *prōtoproedros* and *anagrapheus* in Peloponnesos and as *anagrapheus* in Cyprus; see Bees, “Zur Sigillographie,” 96–98, 233–34; *Life of Meletios*, 60–62. While it is quite clear that he held high positions under Alexios I, it is not certain that he ever became *megas doux* as Bees claimed, *loc. cit.*

18 Bardas Hikanatos governed Hellas and Peloponnesos three times and was known both as *anthypatos* and *praitōr*; see *Life of Meletios*, 59; Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 188. In a document dated 1094 he held the title of “*megalepiphane statos kouropalātēs*,” indicating that he held a significant position at court; see F. Miklosich and J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana* (Vienna, 1860–90), VI, 93.

19 Two seals record the position of Basileios Erōtikos as “*kritēs epī tēs Hellados kai Peloponnēsou*”; see Bon, *Le Péloponnèse*, 194–95, no. 41.

20 Petros Serblias is also known from seals which give him the titles “*magistros bestitōr kai kritēs*” of Hellas and Peloponnesos; see Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 190, 698. Other members of the family are recorded but not in the same region; see PG, 126, col. 321; Anna Comnène, *Alexiade*, II, 37; G. G. Litavrin, *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena* (Moscow, 1972), 152; Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 270, 698; Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la Mer*, 146.

21 Iōannēs Hagiotheodōritēs came from a well-known family (see note 34 *infra*) and held a charge connected with imperial domains, “*hypodrēstēr tōn oikeiakōn*.” He was clearly an influential adviser of Manuel I, and was only supplanted by Theodōros Styppēiōtēs who arranged for him to be sent to govern Hellas and Peloponnesos, a considerable demotion; see Nicetas Choniates, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1835), 77–78; *Synopsis Chronikē*, ed. K. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 7 (1897), 220–21.

22 Basileios Xēros was an ambassador of Manuel I to Sicily in the early part of the reign (1146–47), but it is not known whether he held the post of “*bestarchēs kai kritēs Peloponnēsou kai Hellados*” before or after; see Cinnamos, *Epitome*, 91–92; Bees, “Zur Sigillographie,” 228; Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 189, 715. The family was well established in central Greece; see *Life of Meletios*, 59–60; Miklosich and Müller, *Acta*, IV, 324; Anna Comnène, *Alexiade*, III, 70; Michael Psellos, *Epistulae*, ed. K. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 5 (1876), 279, 282; Každan, *op. cit.*, 135, 203; and note 32 *infra*.

23 Alexios Aristēnos appears to have held an appointment in the province, but his exact title is not preserved; see a letter of Theodōros Prodromos, PG, 133, col. 1274, “*megistos hēgemōn*.” He was one of the many clerics who combined civilian duties with ecclesiastical functions until such dual careers were banned in 1157; see V. Grumel, *Les registres des Actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, I, fasc. 3 (Paris, 1947), no. 1048. His position in Greece must be dated before 1161 when he either died or became a monk; see Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikēs*, 53–57; cf. Každan, *op. cit.*, 39, 65.

24 The post of Alexios Kontostephanos, brother of the *megas doux*, no. 11 *supra*, is recorded in a monody composed after his death in 1176 by Euthymios Malakēs; see A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Noctes Petropolitanae* (St. Petersburg, 1913), 145, 151; Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikēs*, 57–62.

25 On Nikēphoros Prosouch, see *supra*, p. 268.

26 On Démétrios Drimys, see also p. 268.

27 On Nikolaos Tripsychos, see p. 269 and note 77.

28 Kōnstantinos Maurikas ruled Hellas and Peloponnesos as *praitōr*; see his seal, Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 54, 189; cf. Michael, “*bestarchēs kai katepanō Dyrrachiou*,” *ibid.*, 677; Každan, *op. cit.*, 146.

ADMINISTRATION IN		
NAVAL/MILITARY		
Grand Duke—Μέγας Δούξ		
1. ca. 1085	Anonymous	15. ca. 1088–1100
2. ca. 1089/90	Ἰωάννης Δούκας	16. before 1100
3. ca. 1104	Landulf	17. before 1100
4. ca. 1107	Ἰσαάκιος Κοντοστέφανος	18. before 1100
5. ca. 1109	Μαριανὸς Μαυροκατακαλών	19.
		20.
6. ca. 1111/12–1118	Εὐμάθιος Φιλοκάλης . . .	. . . . .
7.	Νικηφόρος Βατάτζης	21. ca. 1140–50
8. ca. 1148	Στέφανος Κοντοστέφανος	22. <i>inter</i> 1143–
9.	Ἀλέξιος Κατακουριανὸς	23. before 116
10. ca. 1156–61	Ἀλέξιος Κομνηνὸς Βρυέννιος	. . . . .
11. ca. 1169–82	Ἀνδρόνικος Κοντοστέφανος	24. ca. 1167
12.	Ἰωάννης Κομνηνός	25. ca. 1182–85
13.	Ἰσαάκιος	26. ca. 1183–85
		27. ca. 1186–87
		28.
		29.
14. ca. 1198–1204	Μιχαὴλ Στρυφνός . . .	. . . . .

29 Choniates frequently refers to *praitores* who are unidentified except as agents of unjust administration. Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell how many governors were appointed to the post between Tripsychos and Stryphnos, but one features most prominently in the *Hypomnèstikon* (ca. 1198); the same official may also be recorded in letters; see Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου, I, 30<sup>1</sup> II, 103, 105, 106–7, 110, 131, 137.

30 Nikètas is recorded as Metropolitan of Athens in the *Synodikon*, first published by V. Laurent, “La liste épiscopale de la Métropole d’Athènes, d’après le Synodicon d’une de ses églises suffraganes,” *Mémorial L. Petit* (Bucharest, 1948), 272–91, esp. 285; and most recently by G. Nowack, *RE* (1961), 227–38. His death is known from inscriptions on the Parthenon columns; see A. K. Orlandos and L. Branouses, *Τὰ Χαράγματα τοῦ Παρθενῶνος* (Athens, 1973), nos. 62, 222; and his seal is published in V. Laurent, *Le Corpus des sceaux de l’Empire byzantin. V: L’Eglise* (Paris, 1972), no. 61.

31 On Nikèphoros, see Laurent, “La liste épiscopale,” 285–86; Orlandos and Branouses, *Τὰ Χαράγματα*, no. 47.

32 Leôn Xèros came from a family well known in Greece; see note 22 *supra*; Orlandos and Branouses, *ibid.*, no. 39; Laurent, *Le Corpus des sceaux*, no. 602; J. Darrouzès, “Obit de deux Metropolites d’Athènes, Léon Xèros et Georges Bourtzès, d’après les inscriptions du Parthenon,” *RE* (1962), 195.

# ION IN TWELFTH-CENTURY GREECE

CIVILIAN Governor—Πραιτώρ	ECCLESIASTICAL Archbishop—Μητροπολίτης
ca. 1088–1105 Κωνσταντῖνος Χοιροσφάκτης	30. ca. 1086–1103 Νικήτας
before 1105 Ἐπιφάνιος Καματηρός	
before 1105 Λέων Νικερίτης	
before 1105 Βάρδας Ἰκανάτος	
Βασίλειος Ἐρωτικός	31. ca. 1103–1121 Νικηφόρος
Πέτρος Σερβλίας	
. . . . Εὐμάθιος Φιλοκάλης	
ca. 1140–50 Ἰωάννης Ἀγιοθεοδωρίτης	
after 1143–80 Βασίλειος Ζηρός	
before 1161 Ἀλέξιος Ἀριστηνός	32. † 1153 Λέων Ζηρός
. . . . Ἀλέξιος Κομνηνός Βρυέννιος	33. 1153–60 Γεώργιος Βούρτζης
a. 1167 Ἀλέξιος Κοντοστέφανος	34. 1160–75 Νικόλαος Ἀγιοθεοδωρίτης
a. 1182–83 Νικηφόρος Προσοῦχ	35. ca. 1175–82 Ἰωάννης
a. 1183–85 Δημήτριος Δριμύς	
a. 1186–87 Νικόλαος Τριψυχός	
Κωνσταντῖνος Μαυρικᾶς	36. ca. 1182–1205 Μιχαήλ Χωνιάτης
Anonymous	
. . . . Μιχαήλ Στρυφνός	

f unjust adminis-  
l to the province  
mnēstikon (of ca.  
ιάτου, I, 307–11;

d by V. Laurent,  
ses suffragantes,”  
owack, *REB*, 19  
e A. K. Orlandos  
his seal is pub-  
1972), no. 601.

ouses, *Τὰ Χαράγ-*

rlandos and Bra-  
de deux Métro-  
enon,” *REB*, 20

33 On the Bourtzēs family, see Darrouzès, *ibid.*, 190–95; B. Georgiadis, Μιχαήλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου καὶ Γεωργίου Βουρτζοῦ λόγοι (Athens, 1882), Introduction, 10–19; Každan, *op. cit.*, 142; and on George, see Orlandos and Branouses, *Τὰ Χαράγματα*, no. 40; Laurent, *Le Corpus des sceaux* no. 603.

34 Nikolaos Hagiotheodōritēs was the most distinguished ecclesiastical representative of this famous twelfth-century family, which included Iōannēs (no. 21 *supra*) and Michael, “*logothetēs tou dromou*”; see A. P. Každan, “Brat’ja Ajofeodority pri dvore Manuila Komnina,” *ZVI*, 9 (1966), 85–94. On Nikolaos, see V. Grumel, “Titulature de métropolités byzantins. II: Les métropolités hypertimes,” *Mémoires L. Petit* (Bucharest, 1948), 159–63; Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikēs*, 14, 204 note 2; Orlandos and Branouses, *Τὰ Χαράγματα*, no. 48; Laurent, *Le Corpus des sceaux*, nos. 604, 605.

35 Iōannēs is known only from his seals, one of which was excavated in the Athenian Agora; see Laurent, *ibid.*, no. 606.

36 On Michael Choniates, see H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 637–38; G. Stadtmüller, “Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen (ca. 1183–ca. 1222),” *OC*, 33 (1934), 138–43; I. C. Thallon, “A Mediaeval Humanist. Michael Akominatos,” *Vassar Mediaeval Studies* (New Haven, 1923), 275–314; Laurent, *Le Corpus des sceaux*, no. 607.